

THE PALACE AT REVERE
AND THE
EARLIER ARCHITECTURAL PATRONAGE
OF
LODOVICO GONZAGA, MARQUIS OF MANTUA (1444-78)

VOLUME I

James Lawson

Ph. D., University of Edinburgh, 1979.



CONTENTS

Volume I.

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgements | 1 |
| Abstract | 2 |
| I. <u>Introduction</u> | |
| Part 1 | 4 |
| Part 2 | 11 |
| II. <u>The Site of the Castle and the Early History of the Palace at Revere.</u> | |
| 1. The Site and the 14th Century Castle | 17 |
| 2. The 14th Century Palace of Lodovico Gonzaga 'Capitano'. | 22 |
| 3. The Marquis Lodovico's Inheritance at Revere. | 28 |
| 4. Revere and the Eastern Defences of the Mantovano. | 36 |
| Summary | 40 |
| III. <u>Planning and the Courtyard at the Beginning of the 1450s.</u> | |
| 1. The Present State of the Palace and Lodovico's Early Works at Revere | 42 |
| 2. Some Remarks on Lodovico's Early Patronage of the Visual Arts. | 52 |
| 3. The Courtyard. | 59 |
| 4. Possible Earlier Courtyard Arrangements. | 79 |
| 5. Luca Fancelli and the Palace at Revere. | 85 |

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 6. Antonio Manetti and the Palace at Revere. | 89 |
| 7. Other Works on the Palace at the Beginning of the 1450s. | 95 |
| 8. The Programme of Building and Finishing at the beginning of the 1450s. | 99 |
| Summary. | 103. |
| IV. <u>The "All'Antica" Ornament of the Palace.</u> | |
| 1. The Installation of Windows and Door in the North Facade. | 105 |
| 2. Windows and Door as Classicizing Elements. | 110 |
| 3. The Introduction of the <u>All'Antica</u> Style to Mantua. | 119 |
| Summary. | 131 |
| V. <u>The Completion of the Structure of the Palace.</u> <u>Functions and Typological Identifications.</u> | |
| 1. The Growth of the Palace. | 133 |
| 2. The Building of the Side Wings. | 147 |
| 3. General and Particular Functions of the Castle and Palace at Revere. | 155 |
| 4. The Palace as Castle. | 164 |
| 5. The Palace as Town House. | 172 |
| 6. The Palace as Country House. | 176 |
| Summary. | 180 |
| VI. <u>Other Buildings in Mantua and the Territory.</u> <u>Lodovico's Government of Building.</u> | |
| 1. "Fancellian" Buildings in Mantua and the | |

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Territory. | 182 |
| 2. The Ospedale di S. Leonardo. | 200 |
| 3. Lodovico and the Work of the Mantuan Building Trade. | 219 |
| Summary. | 237 |
| VII. <u>Lodovico as Patron of Architecture.</u> | |
| 1. Perceptions of the Palace in the 15th century. | 239 |
| 2. Lodovico's 'Public Image'. | 248 |
| 3. Obligations to be a Patron. | 256 |
| 4. Patronage, Historicism and Erudition. The Patron as Architect. | 262 |
| VIII. <u>Conclusion.</u> | 277 |

Appendix I.

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Notes to Text. | 282 |
| Bibliography. | 458 |

Volume II.

Appendix II.

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Notes to Documents. | 1 |
| Documents. | 3 |
| List of Illustrations. | 144 |
| Illustrations. | 156 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have benefitted from the help of many people in the preparation of this thesis. I thank some of them in notes. Others, however, have helped in more general ways. The staff of the State Archive in Mantua were always helpful and obliging: so too were M^{ro} Magri Derio and S^{ig} Carlo Calzona, among others, at Revere. The 'Fondazione Longhi' generously provided funds to enable me to work in Florence and Mantua, and I should like especially to thank its ex-secretary, Dr. Antonio Boschetto, and its ex-director, Prof. Ulrich Middeldorf, for their kind assistance and advice. The reader will observe that photographs illustrating the thesis are mixed in quality. Where photographs from secondary sources are of good quality, credit goes to Ian Bavington Jones. Pamela Goddard must also be praised, as a vigilant typist of text and documents. Among the staff of the Fine Art Department in Edinburgh, my thanks must go first of all to Prof. Giles Robertson, and finally, but by no means least importantly, to my supervisors, Michael Bury and Roger Tarr, whose help has been invaluable. Their generosity with advice and assistance has been characteristic and gratifying: their patience has been quite remarkable.

Abstract.

The Palace at Revere and the Earlier Architectural Patronage of Lodovico Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua (1444-78)

After a brief introduction providing some general information about Lodovico Gonzaga and the reasons for the palace's interest to the student, Chapter II discusses the location of Revere in the territory and gives an account of works done there in the 1370s. The third chapter continues consideration of how older remains conditioned the form of the work of the 1450s. Here, planning is of primary interest and the courtyard is discussed at length. It is suggested that its present layout differs from another proposed earlier using some of the same materials. The traditional attribution of design work to Luca Fancelli is disputed. As elsewhere in the palace, two styles meet in the courtyard. This stylistic discontinuity persisted through the history of construction of the palace. Chapter IV deals with the application of stone-carved all'antica detail to the building, and Lodovico's understanding of the classicizing Tuscan style in the 1450s is discussed. The general order in which walls were built, interior spaces were enclosed and the building grew is the subject of Chapter V. Discussion of the functions of the palace leads to the question of typological identifications of the building as castle, town house and country house. The next chapter seeks to consider contemporary and near-contemporary buildings in Mantua and the territory. The influence of the palace is discussed. The size of the Mantuan building trade and the many projects of Lodovico Gonzaga are also indicated in Chapter VI. Among the rewards of

Lodovico's work at Revere were the praises of the building by contemporaries. These are discussed in Chapter VII. Lodovico is also considered, as a patron of architecture: how he used the visual arts as a means of political expression; how he was constrained to occupy the role of patron; and how it served as an exercise of princely erudition. In a real sense, Lodovico created many of his buildings. A conclusion follows.

I. Introduction

Part 1.

If, as Alberti thought, building tempered the extremes of the elemental qualities,^{1*} perhaps country castles mediated between peace and war. The palace at Revere was associated with a castle, whose peacetime role was administrative and whose wartime role was military. By means of it, the Gonzaga governed and defended part of their territory.

Platina wrote that, after various wars and the death of Nicolas V (in 1455), Lodovico Gonzaga, the second marquis of Mantua, turned his attentions to the peacetime activities of ornamenting the city with public and private buildings, and cultivating the land to make it fertile and delightful (a loose translation of "ad amoenitatem et voluptatem").² For the greater part, the palace at Revere was built in the 1450s - during times of both war and peace.

Lodovico was the son of Gian Francesco Gonzaga, who ruled Mantua from 1407 (at first under the regency of his uncle, Carlo Malatesta) to 1444. Gian Francesco was invested as Marquis of Mantua by Sigismund, the Holy Roman Emperor, in 1433. The Gonzaga had ruled Mantua as hereditary Captains of the People since 1328, when they ousted the previous dominating family, the Bonacolsi. The first Captain was Luigi (d. 1360). He was followed by Guido (d. 1369) and then by Lodovico (d. 1382) (whose name will

*The length of many of the notes has made it necessary to put them all in an appendix at the end of the text.

appear later in connection with building work at Revere).

Lodovico 'Capitano's' son, Francesco, father of Gian Francesco, the first marquis, died in 1407.

The marquis, Lodovico Gonzaga, was a mercenary captain like his forefathers, as well as ruler of Mantua. The fate of his territory was bound up with the fortunes of greater states than his own. As a soldier contracted to more powerful states, his military activity was often abroad.³ In 1454, however, he was contracted to Francesco Sforza of Milan while his brother, Carlo, was contracted to the Venetian Republic. He had a military victory on his own soil over his brother in that year.⁴ The peace of Lodi was concluded in 1454, and Lodovico ceased to be an active condottiere, even though the defences of the territory did not cease to receive attention.

When Platina wrote of Lodovico's shift to peacetime activities after Nicolas V's death in 1455, he seems to have conceived of a relationship between the marquis and the countryside as a whole similar to that which Alberti proposed between Gianozzo, in Della Famiglia, and the villa, the microcosmic countryside.⁵ Lodovico reclaimed land for agriculture in the area between Goito and Mantua ("suopte (sui ipsius) ingenio"), and constructed the Goito canal that provided irrigation to the region and was also navigable.⁶

Over the years, Lodovico concerned himself with commerce and industry. He instituted the "Camera dei Pegni" on 26th April 1462, and outlawed usury on 18th May. However, a scarcity of cash obliged him to repeal the law on 24th May 1466.⁷ Gian

Francesco's imperial diploma of 1433 included the right "...
fabricandi monetam auream, argenteam, aeream et quacumque
aliam...".⁸ Commerce required a trustworthy unit of exchange,
and Lodovico issued an edict on 8th November 1446 warning
against debasing the coinage "sotto pena del fuoco".⁹ He tried
to control commodity prices. In 1453, he issued an edict to the
effect that profiteers would be subject to a fine of 10 lire.¹⁰
He also intervened in the wool manufacturing industry. At the end
of 1466, he prohibited the importation of woollen cloth in order to
protect the local industry. At the same time, he set price controls
on merchants acting locally, to limit the profits of the cartel that,
effectively, he had created.¹¹ Woollen cloth production must have
been flourishing in 1474, for, in December of that year, Cardinal
Francesco Gonzaga, Lodovico's son, obtained the pope's licence
for the sale of cloth in the Levant.¹² Lodovico was instrumental
in promoting the silk industry in Mantua. In January 1463,
Luca Fancelli was at Battifolle in Tuscany. He wrote to Lodovico,
informing him that he could acquire 1000 mulberry trees.
Lodovico wrote back with instructions to buy 300.¹³ The silk
industry became important for the Mantuan economy in the next
century.¹⁴

Lodovico's many works and interventions show the breadth
of his interest in and custody of the territory. His intentions
were clearly to maintain and improve defensive provisions in times
of both war and peace, to improve communications within the
Mantovano, to assist agriculture and industry. Land drainage
and the paving and improving of parts of the city were also sanitary
measures.¹⁵ Utility and good order in the territory were

indissolubly linked with its handsomeness.¹⁶ In all this, Lodovico's princely role was benevolent. Rather than offer the merely feudal promise of military protection to the Mantovano in return for privilege, Lodovico intervened in the life of the territory to improve its condition. He seems to have understood that his position involved obligations to assume an active role in pursuance of the public good. Perhaps it is possible, with some appropriateness, to refer to the state as a work of art, where it is not possible to establish priority between privilege and obligation. Where it is accepted that the one cannot exist without the other, a certain unity is created. At any rate, it can be said that Lodovico's princely posture, insofar as it was directed towards the husbandry of the territory, was not aristocratically self-isolating and sedentary, but was benevolent, paternalistic and active.

The origins of this conception of his role - one with a strong ethical as well as economic element - are not readily identifiable. For one thing, it is not a uniquely distinguishing feature of Lodovico Gonzaga's rule. However, it is likely that an important formative influence on Lodovico was his education at the school of Vittorino da Feltre. Pius mentioned it.¹⁷ So did Platina.¹⁸ The content of Vittorino's teaching is known only from secondary sources, for he himself was not a writer. However, the impression to be gained from Prendilacqua's dialogue¹⁹ and from other sources, including Platina is that the moral philosophical tone of his teaching dominated simple erudition.²⁰ Harrison Woodward wrote that Vittorino "...regarded humanist education as the training for Christian citizenship."²¹ Garin contrasts the

religious end of education at Vittorino's school with the more worldly one at Guarino's.²² There is a universality in the purpose identified by Harrison Woodward and Garin. The general and prescriptive nature of the moral view (as opposed to the partial nature of the pragmatic and primarily erudite view) has, within itself, a means of defining the princely role as a moral one with regard to the governed. Its area of interest is broad. A princeliness integrating martial preparedness and benevolent husbandry would perhaps be attractive to an educator who was praised for "coerenza di vita".²³ Lodovico's practice of attending to the condition of the state in many particulars indicates an appreciation of his role as a universal activity. It indicates a readiness to express his role through continuous exercise of power and acceptance of almost paternal obligation - or almost paternal totalitarianism. It is not being suggested that only an education at Vittorino's school could produce this kind of ruler: but such an education may have increased his self-consciousness in the occupation of his role. It is perhaps significant that another princely product of Vittorino's school, Federico da Montefeltre, was described by Vespasiano da Bisticci as ruling with a similar benevolence.²⁴

Lodovico's paternalistic government consisted in public acts. In that, he was a prince among the people. However, he was also a prince among princes. A private, princely luxury was also appropriate to his station. The apparently minute and precious nature of Mantegna's work for him in the chapel of the Castel di S. Giorgio²⁵ and the Camera degli Sposi are indication of a more seclusive side of his princeliness.

In the more private occupation of his role, Lodovico's education seems, in one respect in particular, to have been similarly formative. If Vittorino's teaching did nothing else, it established, in Lodovico's case, a natural relationship between princeliness and scholarship, or at least learning. The relationship proposes a potentially practical use of learning (in wise government), but it also includes, perhaps, the notion of scholarship as a noble and princely recreation.

Federico Gonzaga's lack of interest in literature caused Barbara of Brandenburg some anxiety: she wrote to Francesco Filelfo on 28th March 1459 "... havemo anchor speranza che quando el cominci a gustar piu le lettere che'l non fa a presente ... el si debia pur adaptar a l'imparare".²⁶ Barbara talked of pleasure in literature and, clearly, saw it as a recreational pursuit. The implication is that she and Lodovico took pleasure in it. Of course, it is very difficult to scribe a line between recreational purposes and practical ones - especially if recreation is a matter of cultivation and disinterest is laudable. However, Lodovico does seem to have taken a private pleasure in literature. This may be inferred from the scholarly fastidiousness of his requirements in December 1459, when he instructed Platina to provide a copy of the Georgics with indications of how they were to be read and with correct orthography. The Bucolics had been prepared similarly. Lodovico also wanted the Aeneid to be copied in Mantua, using Platina's corrections.²⁷ Perhaps there was something of philological pedantry in his insistence upon the correctness of abbreviation marks in the Hebrew bible which was

being prepared in 1461.²⁸ But, if he did not read Hebrew, such insistence was more likely the result of a schooling that regretted corrupt and incomplete texts. Lodovico's recreational reading was not always strictly scholarly. He lent a copy of Lancelot in French to Borso d'Este on 19th December 1468, and sent with it a letter in which he wrote, "... questo libro cont inuamente se tene a la camera nostra et nui a le volte pigliamo piacere assai de lezerlo ...".²⁹ That literary interests were part of a personal cultivation is a conclusion that may be drawn from the nature of Francesco Filelfo's appeal to Lodovico for funds to go to France. Filelfo sought assistance "per honore de le Muse".³⁰ The appeal was, in effect, for art's sake. It was conventional, but for all that, it expected a positive response.

A scholarly interest in ancient literature was accompanied by a certain scholarliness with regard to the relics of ancient art. Lodovico does not seem to have been a dedicated collector of antiquities. But he was interested in the acquisition of ancient sculpture. On 1st April 1462, he received a delivery of four heads from Cristoforo Geremia in Rome. He wrote a letter of thanks on 20th April, and asked to be sent more, as Cristoforo said he could do, provided permission was received from the Pope.³¹

A private and erudite pleasure in the antique may be the explanation for the presence of all'antica details in the palace at Revere. As will be seen, they were introduced despite a certain amount of resistance from local craftsmen. A willfulness, therefore, may be seen in Lodovico's early use of it.

Part 2.

With regard to architecture during Lodovico's rule, it is convenient to keep in mind two parts or elements - local artisan tradition and the all'antica style. Lodovico's period saw, alongside the former, the importation of the latter. Local tradition was a brick architecture with some stone-carved features. (Mantua, on the Lombard plain, is not a stone quarrying region, but there is an ample supply of the raw material of brick manufacture). The all'antica style, as it derived from Tuscan example, involved the stone carver in a primary role. The two styles were distinct - perhaps even antithetical - when they first encountered one another. In later buildings, such as S. Sebastiano and S. Andrea, Alberti's massive Romanitas perhaps made an accommodation between the bricklayer and the carver.

The circumstances of Lodovico's early introduction of the ancient style to Mantua are the subject of this essay. The palace at Revere was built, substantially, in the decade before 1459, when Alberti and Mantegna arrived in Mantua. The year 1459 has been seen as a significant one in the history of art in Mantua during the marquisate of Lodovico Gonzaga - the date of Mantua's commitment to the ancient style. Indeed, it is impossible to doubt that the date was a significant one. But little is known, relatively, about artistic events in Mantua before that time. Perhaps something rather like a dark age is conceived, and Lodovico's purposes after 1459 are seen in too dramatic a light. The nature and extent of the change that took place in the later period of Lodovico's marquisate might be specified were work done in the earlier period

better known and the influences that helped form its general character better understood. An enquiry into the nature of Lodovico's architecture before the arrival of Alberti would concentrate upon the palace at Revere. It was the only large, 'prestige' architectural project of a purely secular character undertaken by Lodovico at that time. It will become clear that a radical reorientation of taste and artistic purpose did not occur after the arrival of Alberti and Mantegna: Lodovico was prepared for their work by experience at Revere and perhaps elsewhere.

It is probably sensible to conceive of the development of Mantuan architecture during Lodovico's rule in three phases or parts that, while notionally successive, could exist concurrently in local architecture, considered broadly, and even in individual buildings. One part persisted and could be called the substratum: it was the local artisan building tradition, consisting principally in the various techniques and building forms of the bricklayer. Upon this substratum, it seems, was laid a first all'antica style of decoration. Then, a more thorough assimilation of all'antica forms to artistic purposes resulted in an integration with, perhaps modified, artisan means. The palace at Revere exemplifies the middle phase (in general terms, for, of course, this conceptual scheme is too simple). The palace prepares for the novelties of Alberti and Mantegna. It becomes clear that a revolutionary change did not take place in Lodovico's appreciation of the ancient style after 1459. The change was of a different nature.

That, early on during Lodovico's marquissate, there was an antithesis between local building practice and the ancient style

- certainly, they were not continuous with one another in the palace at Revere - suggests that the latter was an artifice in a special sense (in the same way that the use of travertine in the new extension to the National Gallery in London is an artifice). More, it suggests that there was a recognition of its special status as artifice.

In Lodovico's architecture, both before and after 1459, there seems to have been a certain private and erudite purpose alongside the various public ones. Filarete's reference to the palace as an early case of the ancient style being used by private patrons in house-building rather than church-building,³² shows that the style was more or less indifferent to typological distinctions between buildings. As such, it was chosen for its beauty or its appropriateness in some erudite way. In either case, that aspect of the palace at Revere was a private exercise as far as Lodovico was concerned.

However, private and public purposes did not remain quite distinct from one another. There was an erudite corollary to Lodovico's paternalism in the case of some buildings. For example, S. Sebastiano would be recognisable as a work of confounding novelty in 1460 in Mantua even without Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga's expression of confusion regarding the relationship of its form to its function.³³ S. Andrea, both outside and in its mighty barrel-vaulted interior, was also a novelty. Perhaps S. Sebastiano made an erudite point in the same way as Alberti intended that S. Andrea should, when he wrote of the Etruscum Sacrum as his model.³⁴ S. Andrea, though built

of brick, was not created entirely within local artisan tradition, for Lodovico believed that only Fancelli understood the plans.³⁵ Insofar as such buildings did make erudite points, Lodovico's pleasure in private scholarship (albeit commendable among the erudite) overlapped with his benevolent public purpose. Here, perhaps, is a measure of his autocracy, for he makes the physical environment, in the form of these buildings, in accordance with his personal purposes and tastes. While acting and, as it were, embracing his obligations in thus dignifying the city, he yet insists upon his privilege in ensuring that the works satisfy his private aesthetic and erudite requirements. Privilege was more than just political.

Private and public purposes combined to create the palace at Revere. The result was rewarded with the praises of contemporaries. Its artistic merit encourages the student's interest and recommends that he try to understand what elicited those favourable remarks. He also finds some indication of the character of Mantuan architecture during the earlier part of Lodovico's rule - a period from which few buildings survive. At Revere is visible evidence of the first incursion of the Tuscan all'antica into Mantua. The building is also of typological interest. Of the many palaces in the Mantovano that Lodovico Gonzaga built or had work done on, it alone ^vsurvives reasonably intact.³⁶ But, as will be seen, it is typologically complex.

In addition the history of its construction is complicated. Documentary sources, archaeological investigation and stylistic analysis are the means whereby the history of its construction, its

successive aspects and its relations with architecture of earlier, later and the same times may be described. Unfinished now, the palace never presented a finished appearance, and like many buildings, it has been altered repeatedly and adapted to different functions. As bricks and mortar, it cannot, then, be thought of as the product of a period. Only in a limited sense may it be so considered; insofar as its appearance at certain selected times may be reconstructed and, at those times, the existence of architectonic and functional intentions - partially realised or merely conceived - be hypothesized. The building's existences in an ideal sense - not a haphazard growth as changing exigencies over the years have reduced it - may be investigated.

Though few of the questions that may be asked may be answered, consideration of the reconstructed building of the 15th century in connection with the copious written documentary material provides information about the organization of building activity and about who did what. The style of details and ideas of planning and design, considered with regard to parts and the whole, show a vacillating orientation of taste and a pragmatic fusion of style and symbol in the building. Finally, the history of construction of the palace points both to unchanging preferences and ambitions and to changing priorities during Lodovico's period of activity; to a moment of decision and change, not only of taste in a broad sense, but also in level of understanding of spacial-architectural form. The palace at Revere, both anticipating and, equally important, resulting from changing attitudes, represented, in the middle years of the 15th century, a stage in the education of a

prince who perhaps, without that lesson, would have failed to make any sense of the ideas of Alberti.

II. The Site of the Castle and the Early History of the
Palace at Revere.

1. The Site and the 14th Century Castle.

A glance at an aerial photograph of Revere and the surrounding region (Fig. 4) shows that the town, with its castle, stands on higher land. As silt has been deposited by the Po, land both up and down river has been reclaimed for farming, and the short edges of fields trace successive encroachments of cultivation upon areas of water and marsh. Revere stands at one of the narrow parts of the Po where crossing is, and was, relatively easy. Clearly, the higher land on both banks caused the river to pass through such a bottleneck. When the river up and downstream was broader, it was a natural place to settle. Archaeological finds of the Roman period confirm its ancient origins.³⁷ The river split into a number of streams just upriver of Revere and fed back into the main course of the river downstream. Thus, the settlement, called "Insula Reveri" in a document of 1020,³⁸ possessed natural defences - though of a more limited effectiveness - also to the south. A wavy fault in the field pattern perhaps traces the courses of two of these, probably sluggish, streams. Roads leading to Revere from the south had to cross them. As may be seen on the photograph, the two roads to the west of the railway line seem, for parts of their lengths, to have generated the field pattern, while, for other parts, run at approximately right angles to common field edges - themselves usually running in a northwest to southeast direction within the area of the fault.

Important for the purposes of communication and defended by water, Revere, with Ostiglia on the northern bank of the Po,³⁹ was also an ideal point at which to control river traffic - commercial and offensive - when trade and political circumstances converted the river to their uses.

According to Amadei, Revere first became a possession of the Mantuans in 1125 when, with the help of troops from Reggio, they attacked, took and completed a half-finished castle belonging to the Modenese.⁴⁰ The stronghold did not remain continuously in the possession of the Mantuans after it was first appropriated.⁴¹ It was one of the properties of Filippino Gonzaga that, on 21st April 1356, passed to his daughter Ziliola and, in June, was ceded to his brothers Guido and Feltrino - as a result of pressure exerted by them, according to the bishop of Mantua writing in 1360.⁴² However, shortly after the acquisition of Revere - in 1357 - they were in need of cash and pawned the property, along with Sermide, for 14,000 florins.⁴³ Redeeming the pledge from the Estensi was a complicated business, but it was finally transacted on 2nd April, 1361, when the Gonzaga paid the whole sum of 14,660 florins (the loan had been made at a rate of $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ interest) to Aldobrandino d'Este who renounced his claim to the territories.⁴⁴ Sermide was pawned again later by Gian Francesco Gonzaga and returned to the possession of Mantua in 1446.⁴⁵

Documents of the 1370's, preserved in the Archivio di Stato di Mantova, show that the castle itself was extensive and that it was associated with a town. 'Johannes de Pogijs', the vicar of Revere, wrote to Lodovico Gonzaga on 20th March (1374/5),
"... quod hodie feci viriliter laborari ad argerem burgi penes

castrum ... " (Doc. 17). It contained buildings of different kinds and perhaps already possessed a population separate from that of the town as in 1463 (Doc. 237) when, during an outbreak of the plague, the inhabitants of the castle complained to the marquis that they had been locked in for 33 days. (It should be noted that the town extended onto the promontory to the north-west of the castle. The dyke separating the modern town from that area given over to cultivation is not ancient. As may be seen on the aerial photograph, the dyke cuts across two, and perhaps at one time three, small canals. The parish church of S. Mostiola⁴⁶ and the Franciscan monastery of S. Ludovico Re di Francia⁴⁷ stood in that area (Fig. 5). The town also extended south-eastwards).

References to a multitude of 'Rocche' - though often, no doubt, more than one expression referred to the same 'Rocca' - give a very confused impression of what this extensive fortified complex was like. Mention is made of a 'Rocha anteriore' (Doc. 21), a 'Rocha anteriore' (Doc. 5) and a 'Rocha posteriore' (Doc. 2, 3, 16). There was a 'Rocha veteri castris Reveri' (Doc. 7) and a 'Rocha nova Reveris' (Doc. 9). The Castel Bresciano also belonged in the network of defences as an outpost.⁴⁸ The existence of the 'Rocca Mantuana' further complicates matters. Probably, like the Castel Bresciano, it was more loosely associated with the castle of Revere (Docs. 44, 47).

With the redemption of the pledge from Aldobrandino d'Este and Lodovico Gonzaga's acquisition of power as 'Capitano', a building campaign was begun.⁴⁹ Perhaps the castle had suffered damage or neglect while in the hands of the Este. The bridge at

its entrance was in need of repair in 1370 (Doc. 1), and repair work was done at other times (e. g. Docs. 4, 10). But new building work was also undertaken. 'Filippino de Capranis' was concerned with more than just maintenance work when he was able to report, at the beginning of 1372, that effective work had been done on the bridge giving access to the 'Rocha posteriore' (Docs. 2, 3).

The words 'anterior' and 'posterior' present problems of interpretation. In which direction did the castle face in the minds of the correspondents? The orientation of the present palace - its principal facade facing the river - implies that at the time of Lodovico 'Marchese' the castle presented its most impressive aspect - or perhaps it would be better to say, directed its interest - to the river, and that the principal entrance to the castle confronted the principal entrance to the palace. An answer to the question depends upon whether the castle made provision only for defence, in which case the river was an effective obstacle to its attackers, or whether it fulfilled an offensive purpose. Controlling river-traffic and paired with Ostiglia on the northern bank of the Po, 'anterior' would refer to the river side of the complex and 'posterior' to the southern side. The second possibility seems to be more likely also in Lodovico 'Capitano's' time.⁵⁰

On 28th April (1372), Filippino da Capranis wrote to Lodovico 'Capitano' listing lengths of constructed wall. Considerable effort had been expended on building work:

"Primo .XV. perticas muri ad Rocham anteriorem
ubi stat Bertholinus. Item .XII. perticas in fovea
ab anababus (sic) partibus Roche. Item .VI. perticas

et .V. brachias muri ad introytum partem
castru. Item .II. perticas in terra que
constituunt in summa .XVII. perticas in terra
et .XVIIIJ. perticas et .V. brachias in omnibus
capitibus fouearum. " (Doc. 5)

Palisades were sunk in May and June. The letter of 31st May (Doc. 7) describes their whereabouts (or rather its whereabouts. 'Unam palfichattam' on 31st May becomes, on 1st June (Doc. 8), 'palfichatas'). But unfortunately, its meaning is not very clear. Apparently, the palisades closed off widened parts of the moat and joined the wall of the castle and the keep but did not impede traffic. In October, work continued around the entrance to the castle (Doc. 15). As has already been suggested, this work was probably done on the river side of the complex. At the entrance, a barbican, containing vaulting and associated with a tower, gave protection to a drawbridge (Doc. 16). The drawbridge probably spanned a moat. Work then concentrated upon walls outside the 'Rocca posteriore'. The intention seems to have been to link it with other walls or buildings. The 'Rocca posteriore' with its bridge may have stood at the corner of the castle where the road coming from the south-east now enters the town.

2. The 14th Century Palace of Lodovico Gonzaga 'Capitano'.

Buildings without a strictly defensive purpose were also erected. On 19th December (1374), 'Johannes de Pogis' wrote to Lodovico "... super facto cuporum expediencium pro domo roche facta in rocha anteriore..." (Doc.21). A letter of 23rd February (1375) mentioned a house "... fienda hic in castro pro manganis ..." (Doc.22). No more specific is Albertino de Selvagi's statement of 3rd March (1376) that work had to be done "... ad domus vestram stipendiarorum..." (Doc.26). Lodovico set about building a house (e. g. Doc.27) or palace (Doc.32) within the castle. It was neither the last palace to be built at Revere for members of the Gonzaga family, nor the first. In the mid-fifteenth century, the importance of Lodovico 'Capitano's' house was usurped by that of Lodovico 'Marchese's'. Before the building of Lodovico 'Capitano's' house, there was a house belonging to Filippino Gonzaga. On 14th October (1376?), Albertino de Selvagi, who was vicar of Revere at the time, wrote about Filippino's house:

"Circha autem domus destructam nobillis militis domini Filippini de Gonzaga, de lapidibus repertis in illa, muralie ipsius domus in tribus quadris cum dimidio volunt .X. perticas et sunt trium testarum et alte, cum fundamento, duos pertichas. Circha feramentum repertum in ipsa domo sunt reperti .XXX. clavi spansse et .CCC. alij clavi perni (?). Circha cuppos veteres repertos in ipsa domo invenj ^miiiij .cclxxxvij cuppos numeratos pro magistrum Jacobum de Curtis." (Doc. 34)

The house was demolished when Albertino wrote on 9th October (1377) of "... quadrellos novos et veteres perceptos et habitos de domo prostrata ad terram egregii militis domini filippini de Gonzaga ..." (Doc.40). Perhaps Lodovico initially intended to incorporate the walls of Filippino's house into his own. That may have been the house referred to and it was the impracticability of that proposal that caused Albertino de Selvagi to write to Andrea de Godio on 26th June (1376) regarding an intended journey to Mantua when he would inform Lodovico of the outcome of discussions at Revere: "... omnino necessarium erit muram facere dictam domus in totum..." (Doc.31). Other readings are, of course, possible. For example, Filippino's house may have stood elsewhere and have been demolished for its materials while Lodovico's house rose.

Lodovico's house seems to have been begun in spring, 1376. The building was already started, or it consisted in adding to earlier structures, on 25th March (1376) when Albertino wrote to Lodovico requesting the services of two bricklayers, "...pro murando domus vestram de Revero in ea parte ubi est necesse ..." (Doc.27). At this stage there was little sense of urgency, for Lodovico turned his attention to the building of a dovecot. On 3rd April (1376) it had been put to the bricklayers that they build it but they, showing remarkable solidarity, and encouraged, perhaps, by the support of the vicar, refused to work until satisfied as to who would pay them.

"Qui responderunt quod nulmodo murarent ipsam
(the dovecot) nisi primo scirent qui est ille qui
debet eis solvere pro labore: scio cum dicant

se non habere unde vivere." (Doc. 28)

Albertino was instructed to collect materials and he asked Lodovico to send lime on 30th April (1376) (Doc. 29). Bricks were lacking on 4th May of the same year (Doc. 30). A granary was also being built on 20th November (1379) (Doc. 46).

The building of the palace is better documented. Although for a while, the dovecot took priority, work on the palace must have progressed for, on 26th June, the interests of Lodovico's house were taking over from those of the house of Phebo, Lodovico's bastard son.⁵¹ Albertino proposed to use bricks reserved for Phebo's house in Lodovico's (Doc. 31). Phebo's house continued to receive scant attention. It was Lodovico, who, before 14th April (1377), had proposed very flimsy walls, only one header thick, above the level of the beams of his son's house. Albertino suggested instead a double brick thickness for those walls in order that "... esset bonum opus et pulchrum ..." (Doc. 36). Lime was needed for Lodovico's dwelling house. On 28th May (1377), roof tiles "pro domo vestra in revere noviter facta" had been supplied from the furnace at Revere. Phebo's house was also near completion (Doc. 38). Lodovico investigated the possibility of building another, probably modest, house ('stabulum') near Phebo's. But Albertino wrote back that there was no space for building on three sides - what space there was being sufficient only for water to run off into. The house, on its fourth side, was only ten braccia from the castle wall and that space served as a street (Doc. 39).

Despite the reference in the letter of 28th May (1377) to

Lodovico's "...domo...noviter facta", later documents make clear that the house was unfinished. Lodovico seems, in fact, to have built a complex of structures. It is not clear whether or not they were closely associated, to comprise, at the end of the building programme, one extensive palace. However, it was possible for correspondents to write of, "...domus vestra granarij..." (Doc. 46) and "domus vestram novamente factam pro stallis" (Doc. 36). The use of the word 'domus' does not necessarily imply Lodovico's domestic occupation. A letter of 26th June from Giovanni de Poggis referred "...de facto lignaminis conducendi hominibus pro domibus vestris ibi fiendis..."⁵² The use of the plural suggests that the word had a general meaning rather than only the specific one of 'domicile'. But one of those houses provided accommodation for Lodovico. He seems to have been particularly interested in work in progress in October (1377). Perhaps that interest was particularly personal.

By 9th October (1377) work on the house was advanced, and Albertino gave an account of what building work had been accomplished (Doc. 40). He wrote again on 11th October (1377?) (Doc. 41), to assure Lodovico that the foundations and walls were strong enough, and to explain why 20,000 extra bricks were required. On 9th October, he wrote, "... fecte sunt sponde muri ipsius domus altitudinis sex brachiorum usque ad planam et quia plana est duplex ceput unum brachium a sex brachiis supra et fecte sunt quatuor columpne de lepidibus pro maiori fortitudinis ipsius domus ..." (Doc. 40). Shortly, the entire first floor would be laid. The letter of 11th October paraphrases that of 9th, though

the descriptions of wall do not appear to accord precisely.

Strangely, the 'sponde muri' that, on 9th October, were described as being 6 braccia high 'usque ad planam', were described, on 11th October, as being $7\frac{1}{2}$ braccia 'cum infondratura traborum'. One and a half braccia was given 'pro infondrando claves et tectum'. It is likely that the 'infondratura traborum' was also $1\frac{1}{2}$ braccia deep. A later document, of 8th January, 1454 (Doc. 125), listing numbers and sizes of beams required for the palace, may be taken to show that $1\frac{1}{2}$ braccia was needed for the sinking of beams and to suggest that traditional building practice involved the laying of two 9-inch deep beams, one on top of another.⁵³ But the 'plana' is described, in the letter of 9th October, as being 'duplex ceput unum brachium'. It would probably be wise not to be too ingenious in trying to interpret that passage to make it refer to $1\frac{1}{2}$ braccia of brickwork or to suggest that the writer made a mistake and intended to write "Unum brachium cum dimidium". Perhaps 'infondratura traborum' may itself be expressible in separate groups of brick courses.

The total height of the three-storeyed building described was $25\frac{1}{2}$ braccia which, in feet and inches when a Mantuan braccio is about 18.32",⁵⁴ is approximately 38'11" (11.862m.). Of that height, 34'4" (10.465m.) were above ground. The wall diminished in thickness from a width of five headers⁵⁵ - or 2'6" - at the foundations to three headers - or 1'6" - on the top storey. Rooms would have had low ceilings - 6 braccia - or 9'2" (2.794m.) - on the lowest level and 5 braccia - or $7'6\frac{1}{2}"$ (2.299m.) - on the others - and the building would have been modest. But it would have been

strong - as strong as parts of the castle where a defensive capability was required. Albertino described the foundations of vaulted parts at one of the keeps in the castle at Revere on 7th October (1376): "Item fondamento duorum brachiorum alte quinque testarum et ab inde super quinque brachiorum quatuor testarum" (Doc. 33).

On 27th November (1379), Paganino de Poltronibus wrote to Lodovico, "Nottiffico per presentes quod domus coperta in totum cuppis die sabati proxima passata et est bene / ... fortificata lapidi a fundamentis usque ad superficionem..." (Doc. 47). This may be the same house.

3. The Marquis Lodovico's Inheritance at Revere.

The present palace stood within the old castle compound. The chronicler, Andrea Schivenoglia, visited Revere in 1450⁵⁶ and wrote of that year "... se lavorava fortemente al palazzo chie in lo chastello de Revero ...".⁵⁷ In the previous year, Lodovico had built a wall for the castle.⁵⁸ Filarete, in his treatise on architecture, composed in the first half of the 1450s, referred to "... una casa chelli (i.e. Lodovico) a fatta fare auno suo castello insu il po".⁵⁹

The remains of the castle compound no longer exist, but, according to Sissa, the palace was situated at its south-east corner. Also, he wrote that the building utilized two of seven towers.⁶⁰ Indeed, the remains of those two towers are still visible under the roof of the north wing (Figs. 6 & 7). Machicolated, they resemble the free-standing tower about twenty yards north of the north-west tower of the palace (Fig. 8). A doorway high up in the south face of that tower suggests the existence of a walkway at one time - when the tower was probably linked with others. Its north and west faces, being without any round-topped openings like those found on the south and east faces, are more opaque and, no doubt, faced outwards. A wall joins the two towers incorporated in the palace and, in its lower reaches,⁶¹ probably belongs with them to an earlier ring of defences.⁶² The old towers break forward towards the south from the line of the wall that joins them. Before the building of the palace, the line of defence that existed about 50 yards to the south must have been raised.⁶³ The inner line used in the palace must originally have looked to an enemy to

the south. The southernmost line of defence must have been built before the inner line was incorporated in the palace, for otherwise the building would have been undefended on its south side. A small canal, visible on the aerial photograph, ran in an east-south-east direction towards the corner of the compound where, having passed under the line of the new north-north-east running dyke that now separates the town from the promontory on which stood part of the old town and the church of S. Mostiola, it turned towards south-south-east to follow a line running parallel to the tower-joining wall. Its waters may have fed the old moat and it may mark the line of outer fortifications.

Whereas the wall with the two towers faced south,⁶⁴ the building in which they were incorporated faces north. This reversal was made possible by the existence of the southern defence works, part of which may have been the 'Rocha posteriore'. (Doc. 3, 16).

The walling of the house was clearly described in the letter of 11th October (1377?) (Doc. 41). The palace of the marquis, Lodovico Gonzaga, incorporates old walls. But it is unfortunate that the whereabouts of Lodovico 'Capitano's' house cannot be established and the question whether Lodovico 'Marchese' used the older structure or structures when he built his own palace be answered confidently. The walls described on 11th October (1377?) cannot be identified positively in the extant palace.

But what of circumstantial evidence? Figures 12 and 13 show the exterior elevations of the east and west wings of the palace. The divisions of the elevation of the wall described in

Document 41 are shown at the sides. The floor of the piano nobile (its height measured at the stairwell of the west wing) is 21'3" (6.477m.) from the pavement. That is very close to 14 braccia (which is 21'4.48" or 6.515m.). The "seconda intrabatura" mentioned on 11th October (1377), was $7\frac{1}{2}$ braccia plus $6\frac{1}{2}$ braccia, or 14 braccia above the top of the foundation level. The first floor of the palace, at 10' (3.048m.) from the ground, is 6br. $6\frac{1}{2}$ br". The second floor is 11'3" (3.429m.) above the first, or 7br. $4\frac{1}{2}$ br". These two heights are reversed in the letter - though the description of 9th October may accord with the existing structure. The west wing's horizontal divisions marked according to the lines of older recessed windows (Fig. 9) seem to bear no relation with the description of the 14th century wall, but the top floor level, marked with the dash line, does correspond closely. On the east wing facade, some of the older windows, especially towards the north, do fall within the guidelines set by the old wall elevation. It is possible that Lodovico 'Capitano's' walls were used in the 15th century structure.

If Lodovico 'Marchese's' palace is erected upon the walls and foundations of the 'Capitano's' house, building work had already been done outside the inner compound of the castle of which the two old towers incorporated in the palace were a part. The side walls of the palace were built in at least two distinct campaigns (Figs. 10, 11). Bevel-recessed windows are to be seen on the lower levels, but not on higher ones. Figures 12 and 13 and Pocket Drawings 2 and 3 show that changes were made in the fenestration of the lower levels in accordance with the disposition

of windows higher up. It is possible that the earlier parts date to Lodovico 'Capitano's' period of activity. That possibility finds only circumstantial support from other considerations, but a history of construction is simplified by it.

No documents for the years 1401 to 1443 survive in the Mantuan State Archive to give information about whether palace-building was undertaken between the times of Lodovico 'Capitano' and Lodovico 'Marchese'.⁶⁵ In 1444 an unfinished palace existed, for Lodovico proposed to roof and floor a part of it for the use of his vicar (Doc. 50). Either a new palace had been built in the fifty or so years intervening since the death of Lodovico 'Capitano' or Lodovico 'Marchese' took over that 14th century palace, perhaps extended and unfinished, or perhaps damaged by accident or neglect and therefore in need of repair.⁶⁶ The evident modesty, at least in height, of Lodovico 'Capitano's' building did not necessarily recommend it to later inhabitants, but it did, presumably, possess distinction compared with other habitable buildings in the castle compound. Its foundations were new and substantial. It enjoyed, too, a favoured location. Any later palace, unless the interior organization or the principal orientation of the castle was altered, would have had good reason to appropriate the most substantial structure and the most distinguished position. Those parts of Lodovico 'Marchese's' palace that incorporated older stretches of wall may indeed be utilizing foundations and walls of the older palace rather than those of less permanent and less important buildings. Wall thicknesses above ground in the west wing match those described

in the letter of 11th October (1377?) and it is worth observing that such an elaborate description would perhaps have been unnecessary had it been normal practice to construct walls of the dimensions given. The wall described may be supposed to have been different from walls of other buildings contained in the castle. If the walls of the east and west wings were built after Lodovico 'Capitano's' time, they still accepted the discipline of the 14 braccia floor level established, in that case, for some other structure, in the 1370s. If Lodovico 'Marchese' built the present palace from the ground up, a very radical change in plan took place during construction. Such a change is difficult to imagine.

Although it is not certain that he used the walls of Lodovico 'Capitano's' house, it is likely that Lodovico 'Marchese' made use of the existing structures. The old walls, of the side wings, would have been parts of structures existing "extra muros" (though within the larger compound), at right angles to the wall between the towers. They would have created a broad street leading up to, say, a gate in that wall. However, it should be noted that if one of the side wings of the present palace was originally Lodovico 'Capitano's', that earlier palace was not orientated in relation to 'anterior' and 'posterior' parts of the castle as, it has been suggested, these words were understood.

All three perimeter walls of the present building utilize remains of old walls and windows. The north wall, joining the two towers of the principal facade, possesses the remains of two old windows to the left of the main entrance.

They are similar though not identical with the windows of the lower walls of the side wings, lacking, as they do, a moulding along their bottom sides (Fig. 14). The stretch of wall in which they are found does not run uninterrupted along the whole length of the facade. Instead, a seam in the brickwork, about two feet to the left, shows that the eastern part of the wall was built to abut and continue the line of the wall (Fig. 15). To the right of the windows, the brick courses are also interrupted.⁶⁷ As on the side facades, two separable campaigns of building raised the wall to its present dimensions. Of course, it does not necessarily follow that the same two broadly distinguishable campaigns saw the raising of the north facade and the side wings. As has been seen, at least three distinguishable campaigns were needed to carry the palace to its present state of completion. First, the old towers and perhaps their adjoining wall were built. The lower walls of the east and west wings rose next. And, finally, the building was raised to its present height. It is possible that the stretch of wall to the left of the main entrance is what remains of an old gatehouse and was part of the first, tower-building campaign, as opposed to the second one, which saw the placing of the lines of the side wings and their building at the lower levels.

The rest of the north facade was raised during the third campaign. Unlike the lower walls of the side wings, it was raised from the ground anticipating its present height. Consideration of the plan of the building makes that clear (Fig. 17, and Pocket Drawing 1).⁶⁸ The inner walls of the towers ('A' in Fig. 18) to the north of the wall 'B', dividing the north wing lengthwise,

follow the line of the thicker walls 'C' that are at the bases of the old towers and form the sides of the north loggia of the courtyard. As has been seen, these old tower walls are corbelled out to form machicolations under the roof. The crenellated walls above are flush with wall continuing their line to the north, to form the towers that are visible on the exterior. Had the northern parts of the present tower walls 'A' followed the back lines of the old tower walls (line 'x') and the walls of the side wings, a step-back would have resulted above the level of the machicolations, and the towers, viewed from the exterior, would no longer have been smooth-sided outcrops from the main body of the building. Figure 19 makes the point three-dimensionally. If the walls were begun with the intention of raising them to a lesser height than they have, there would have been no reason to displace them towards the axis of the building. (As will be seen below, the side walls of the north loggia were probably thickened later, when the columns were placed and the north vault was built.).

The reversal of the direction of interest of the structural complex and the negation of the defensive purpose of the old machicolated towers and their joining wall (albeit already somewhat reduced by the "extra mural" structures that constitute parts of the side wings) took place when the northern facade with its towers was begun - at the third phase of construction. Lodovico 'Capitano's' work, if his is indeed incorporated in the present palace, does not appear to have anticipated events around the north facade, for stretches of the lower walls of the side wings towards the courtyard and, probably, the exterior walls

whose windows are stylistically related to some of those under the side arcades, are earlier than the north facade, where that form of bevel-recessed window was abandoned. That form was also abandoned on the higher levels of east and west wing facades and was replaced by a fenestration similar in proportion, elevation and grouping to that of the north facade. The lower side walls are separable from the upper side walls and the north facade.

4. Revere and the Eastern Defences of the Mantovano.

Like Lodovico 'Capitano', Lodovico 'Marchese' was conscious of the strategic importance of Revere. The local people were obliged to provide guards and attend to works of maintenance (Doc.52). Schivenoglia recorded that, in 14⁴~~99~~⁹⁹,⁶⁹ Lodovico had built a castle wall towards the river - the start of work being accompanied by a fine display of ceremonial; the placing of gold and silver coins in the wall by Lodovico himself. He continued to occupy himself with Revere's defences. The repair of a tower was to be attended to on 15th May 1455 (Doc. 130). On 22nd May, 1466, he was informed by Lodovico della Torre that a small tower had collapsed (Doc.238). The following year, he proposed to construct palisades. However, the men of Revere, who were short of sufficient quantities of strong wood, preferred the idea of constructing the defences of brick (Doc.239). On 24th August, 1467, Antonio Bonatto wrote, regarding work of fortification, "... sera per pocha e presta asai bella opera..." (Doc.240). Work on the maintenance of dykes was undertaken continually.⁷⁰

Such attention to the defences of Revere confirms its strategic importance. But that importance was in connection with, most obviously, Ostiglia⁷¹ and with a line of defence that gave protection to the Mantovano on its south and south-eastern frontiers. To the west and south, Mantua had, in the Oglio and Po, natural frontiers. There, the territory overlapped and made of them second lines of defence. However, between Mantua on the Mincio and Verona on the Adige to the east there were no

natural defences except for narrow obstacles like the rivers Tartaro and Tione. Lodovico had territorial ambitions in the direction of Verona. Indeed, he had inherited them.⁷² A certain amount of friction along the insecure eastern frontier would be expected. A long line of castles and strongholds and centres of population marked that border. It extended from Sermide at the south-east corner of the territory to Carbonara di Po, Borgofranco sul Po to the two towns of Revere and Ostiglia that occupy a junction between the defensive line and an obvious passage through it, the Po itself - a point doubly vulnerable and, if strong, doubly effective. From there the line passed north and west through Torre di Mezzo, Ponte Molino, Castel d'Ario, Castelbelforte and Castle Mantovano (Fig. 20).

Cassi Ramelli, believing that the majority of castles did not provide for active defence but formed part of groups, lines or networks, so that the attacked could abandon castle after castle to the enemy until they could assemble an adequate force or could enjoy safety in one castle, confident that the enemy saw in another a more important strategic objective, distinguishes four categories of castles.⁷³ There were those of permanent occupation, those for military control ("o di esazione fiscale") along borders at important points ("percorsi comuni e obbligati"), those that were safe refuges thanks to their locations in difficult terrain ("a ostacoli di superiore risorsa") and those of temporary refuge. The first type, whose purpose was to exploit and safeguard a rich district, would describe Revere. It was a town and the administrative centre of the area. Standing on the bank of the Po,

it also fits the second category. The provision of strong defences seeks to make a castle - valuable because it fills one or both of the first two categories - fulfil also the third requirement.

Lodovico, especially during the earlier period of his rule, before the time of which Platina wrote, "... finito bello ad opera pacis conversus,"⁷⁴ concerned himself with the territory's defences and had work done at several castles on the eastern border - Ostiglia, Revere and Ponte Molino. He seems to have thought in terms similar to those of Cassi Ramelli, for Ostiglia was evidently a key stronghold. He wrote to Gianfrancesco de Ubertis from Mantua on 31st January, 1450, of the castle "... el qual e la salvezza de le terre de qua da puo et anche de quelle de la" (Doc.62). Revere was also important (Doc.90). Platina described a work that surely seemed worth mentioning in Lodovico's view: "Ad Sermedem enim et Hostiliam Reverumque quae in ripa Padi sunt sita palos oblongos et grossos duplici ac triplici ordine in flumine defixit, catenis colligatos, quo navibus in terram accessus vetaretur ..." ⁷⁵ Revere was a customs post ⁷⁶ and a crossing place. Amadei referred to the port, ⁷⁷ and a letter of 1453 contains Lodovico's instructions regarding its construction (Doc.121).

Among other things, defence was served by a high population and its increase was encouraged in the area of Revere. A proclamation of 29th March, 1402, conceded to the inhabitants of Revere, Sermede and Quistello the right to deal with their property as they saw fit: "Et hoc fecit prefatus magnificus dominus quia subditis quis vult gratiam facere liberalem et ut

ipsa castra melius habitentur et domibus fulciantur..." (Doc. 49).⁷⁸

Revere must have been fortified by an adequate population by the middle of the century, for, in 1453 Lodovico Gonzaga issued an edict requiring the inhabitants to refer such transactions to his factor general, Rolandino della Volta.⁷⁹ Cardinal Roteno

remarked upon how the area was well-ornamented by occupation (Doc. 223). Flavio Biondo noted, as he recalled the pope's visit to Revere en route to Mantua in 1459, that it was a "nova terra".⁸⁰

Summary

It has not been possible to define in detail the nature and character of the castle and palace that Lodovico 'Marchese' acquired in 1444. However, documentary references to works of fortification and house building in the 1370s give some indication of the scale of the urbanistic and castellated complex at Revere, and perhaps of the importance of the site within the system of the Mantuan defences.

The main lines of the elevation of the palace of Lodovico 'Capitano' are known from Albertino de Selvagi's letter of 11th October (1377?) (Doc. 41). The fact that the piano nobile of the present palace coincides closely with one of the lines of that earlier elevation, and the fact that remains of the older windows of the east and west facades also tend to follow the same division suggest that some of the older structures incorporated into the present building should be associated with Lodovico 'Capitano's' period of activity.

Broad phases of adaptation and construction, creating the present palace, can be identified on the basis of a study of the structure. The old towers incorporated into the north wing belonged at first to a fortified rather than a domestic complex. When the lower side wings were first built, they existed outside the ring of defence of which the old towers were a part. A third campaign of building raised the building to its present height and completed the north wing. It is this third campaign that should be associated with Lodovico 'Marchese', for the north facade was raised from ground level anticipating its present height, and

the facade contains the stone-carved window frames that were prepared during the 1450s. (As will be seen in Chapter IV, Section 1, the building of the north facade wall went forward approximately in pace with the provision of the window frames.).

It follows from consideration of the northern part of the north wing that Lodovico 'Marchese's' intentions for the palace involved the creation of a piano nobile. It will be shown, in the next chapter, that the intention should be associated with the use of the columns and the making of an arcaded courtyard. It seems that Lodovico first proposed to continue the building in a style consonant with that of the earlier structures. However, he had not long begun the work, when he abandoned that decorative treatment, indicative of which is the terracotta-framed window type of the side wings, in favour of stone-carved windows in the all'antica style. Instead of a free system of fenestration following from a varied grouping of internal spaces, he adopted a more ordered placing. And instead of a courtyard arrangement with a simple logic, he used columns and capitals of north Italian workmanship as well as Tuscan decorative elements to create the present, unusual courtyard and provide structural support for a grand salone in the north wing.

III. Planning and the Courtyard at the Beginning of the 1450s.

1. The Present State of the Palace and Lodovico's Early Works at Revere.

In 1459, the palace was unfinished. Both Pius II⁸¹ and Flavio Biondo⁸² noted that fact. It is unfinished now, for the fourth wing is missing and the brickwork at the south ends of the east and west wings was clearly intended to be bonded in with walls continuing in a southerly direction and closing off the south side (Figs. 21, 22). The east wing was not built to its full height southwards from just past the side entrance (Pocket Drawing 4). Documentary evidence suggests that the visitors to the palace in that year saw a building substantially the same in size as the present structure. Later alterations have to no great extent changed the general shape of the building. Instead, these alterations have consisted in reorganizing parts of the interior.⁸³ In the exterior walls and in the walls skirting the courtyard, windows and doors have been opened and closed.

Several campaigns of restoration have been undertaken since the war. Others may have been undertaken earlier.⁸⁴ For the Empress Maria Theresa, the tower that stands to the north of the palace was restored in 1755.⁸⁵ Between about 1853, when Brizeghel published a lithograph of the north facade of the palace (Fig. 23) and 1970, when Montanara wrote about works of restoration, alterations had been made to some of the chimney stacks.⁸⁶ During the Second World War, two-fifths of the town was destroyed when 140 bombs were dropped. On 7th

January 1947, fire broke out in the east wing, but damage was not severe. Restoration work was undertaken in 1949 and the roof of the north wing was replaced.⁸⁷ Graffiti in the space under the roof of the north wing celebrate work done in May, 1959. Later, the two recessed windows on the facade were uncovered, the intonaco was stripped from the crenellations and the courtyard garden was dug up to reveal, at a depth of 80cm., the original brick pavement. A new pavement has been laid. It is proposed to raise the roof by about 80cm.⁸⁸

Over the years, the alteration of the building in small ways - the opening of a door here, the bricking up of a window there - has changed its character but not its general outline. And because, in the middle of the 15th century, the building already had old windows closed and new ones opened, it is not always easy to guess the date of a particular alteration. The palace now contains the offices of the Questura, the local primary school and several flats including, in the north wing, that of the caretaker. Those occupants have maintained their parts of the building with varying degrees of fastidiousness and it is not always clear that, say, a restored window is old or new. A building whose parts, in the 15th century, answered the needs of one man and his family -directly insofar as one part would be for his personal use and indirectly insofar as another would be for his service - now fulfils the needs of the public services and of private individuals. It is now neither an exclusively public nor an exclusively private building. This diversification of purposes makes sure that the building is no anachronism, but that fact

complicates the task of the archaeologist who would perhaps rather deal with an object abandoned in aboriginal neglect.

The palace at Revere, adapting itself to older structures and to new uses, is perhaps typical of a whole group of buildings; the outcome of a building method that may be distinguished from the modern one of working from the ground up, according to the architect's very strict instructions. A building begun from foundations possesses an artificiality - an origin in human invention. Adaptation and extension is often difficult to achieve with a satisfactory degree of harmony between old parts and new. A building using old foundations is the outcome of a more pragmatic ingenuity. In the 15th century, it was evidently unusual for a building to be started from foundations. Distinction attached to the man who put up the money for a building that began underground and did not obey the wayward discipline of old foundations. Giovanni Aldobrandini said as much when he recommended such a procedure to Lodovico Gonzaga on the project for the choir of SS. Annunziata in Florence.⁸⁹ Vespasiano da Bisticci thought it worthy of mention that Cosimo de' Medici began the Palazzo Medici in 1444 from the foundations.⁹⁰ The growth and development of a building begun at foundations are intellectual and imaginative. Evidence of the growth and development of buildings using old walls and foundations is, of course, in the buildings themselves. Such evidence is to be found in the palace at Revere.

However, the palace did not accept meekly the discipline of older parts as it rose to its present size. Rather it has an

order that seeks to imply its independence of the discipline that earlier parts exerted. The lines of the walls of the side wings were accepted, and the line of the north facade followed that established by the stretch of wall containing the two *ædicules*. But, in that, regularity was given to the plan of the building. Raised to its present impressive height, the palace has a visual coherence that would seem to deny its dependence on earlier remains. Over the exterior walls of the east and west wings a system of fenestration runs rough-shod over earlier groupings of those bevel-recessed windows (Figs. 12 & 13, and Pocket Drawings 2 & 3), with their half-circular containing mouldings (Fig. 24). The machicolations of the two towers of the north wing that, it has been argued, were part of a south-facing line of defence, are not visible from the outside, where the fortified aspect of the building is softened somewhat by the smooth surfaces of wall and crenellation. The north facade gives an appearance of order and, thence the impression that the building as a whole is the product of one period, one set of requirements and one set of freely-made decisions. Only a quietly-lingering sense of a discontinuity between the peaceable domesticity implied by the use of carved details and the more formidable fortified character of towers and crenellations hints at two phases of planning, and the priority of the second aspect of the facade. The discontinuity of styles on the east and west facades, however, is quite obvious. Evidently, the demands of symmetry over-rode those of compliance with the character of already-existing parts.

In the 15th century, other attempts were made to give an

intellectual order to structures with an organic character. The facade of the Palazzo Rucellai, for example, is ordered to hide a lack of clear order behind. The desire for order and symmetry in the Palazzo Piccolomini at Pienza forced Bernardo Rossellino to insert a blind door on the west side. The drawings of city plans by Filarete, Francesco di Giorgio and Leonardo state quite explicitly the ideal of order. Spatial fudging could be achieved with the invention of a repeatable unit, given character by architectural members of consistent scale and design, but whose surfaces were deprived of character by the application of intonaco. The bay used by Michelozzo and others for cloisters may be varied in size but the vistas of identical columns and the understated separation of bay from bay, giving the impression of additive and single space at the same time, make sure that no irregularity is eye-catching. The elevations and plan of the palace at Revere demonstrate the response to a fifteenth century desire for order and clarity. As will be seen, the courtyard space was designed to give an appearance of regularity that for functional reasons it could not in fact have.

When did that desire for order become a positive imperative? The dating of the lower parts of the walls of the wings with the 'old' windows, has a terminus ante quem in 1451, when work progressed on the north facade (Doc. 93). As has been said before, the walls described so carefully by Albertino de' Selvagi and belonging to the house of Lodovico 'Capitano' may be identified in the present building - but not with total confidence. The important point here is not the answer to the question of

whether or not Lodovico 'Marchese' used the remains of Lodovico 'Capitano's' house but whether he used the remains of any building at all. Were the walls under discussion built before his marquisate?

It is unlikely that the whole building is the work of Lodovico. He possessed a palace at Revere at the beginning of his rule (Doc. 50). There is no evidence that he abandoned it, to build, from about 1450 on, a new palace. The consequence of an argument that he began the present building from scratch is that he changed, very radically, a half-finished building. Moreover, there is the point that, if Lodovico did not build the palace from foundations in about 1450, it is very unlikely that he did so earlier. As will be seen, documentary references to work done in the 1440s are relatively few, and do not indicate a single, ambitious project to raise a completely new structure. If there had been such a project, might not Andrea Schivenoglia have mentioned it? His chronicle starts in 1445. It mentions the building of castle wall in 1449 and work on the palace in 1450. If works on the palace were of modest scope in the 1440s, it is likely that they used older structures.

The arguments that support the suggestion that Lodovico 'Marchese' used old remains, though they are not strong, in fact tend to suggest that the remains date to Lodovico 'Capitano's' time. No documents of the period between the rules of the two Lodovicos give information about work that may have been carried out. Also, in his later years, Gian Francesco, Lodovico 'Marchese's' father, was short of funds.⁹¹ Evidence of his poverty

is the fact that he pawned Sermide in 1441.⁹² Possibly, he cut back on building programmes.

Dating the lower walls is not helped by consideration of the form of the older brick windows with their two-inch semi-circular mouldings, six-inch flat framing and chamfered inner surfaces. Such windows are found frequently in Mantua, and the form did not pass from use after it was superceded at Revere.⁹³ If, as seems likely, the lower stretches of wall to the south of the old towers date to before Lodovico's period of activity, the proposal to give the building its present plan, by building additional lengths of wall in the north wing, and to raise the whole structure to its present height, must date to the years between Lodovico's acquisition of power in 1444 and 1451, when work carving the stone-framed windows was in progress (Doc. 93).

However, there is reason to believe that the lower perimeter walls of the building at east and west are not all of the same period, despite the fact that bevel-recessed windows appear all along the facades. The lower flanks of the towers, the brickwork of which is, overall, smooth and even, and appears to have been built course by course in a regular manner over a relatively brief period, contain windows of the 'old' type (Fig. 10). There is continuity between the wall in which these windows are found and that above in which are the 'new', framed windows. There is also continuity with the north facade wall, which is similarly even. The bevel-recessed windows of the lower flanks of the towers probably date to the same time as the lower stretches of the facade. The third phase of building, then, would consist of two parts; one

using the 'old' fenestration and the other, the 'new'. Despite the change of fenestration, this remains one phase, for it involved the facade and associated internal walls of the towers, and therefore the raising of the building to its present height. Lodovico seems to have begun the building with the intention of continuing the old fenestration, but to have changed his mind at mezzanine level.

Schivenoglia wrote of the year 1450 that, "se lavorava fortemente al palazzo che e in lo chastello di Revere". The palace was identifiable as such, though it was far from finished to the point of completion at which Flavio Biondo and Pius II saw it. But work had been undertaken on the palace before the time of which Schivenoglia wrote. First, the vicar was provided for in 1444. Flooring and roofing were about to be done on 16th December of that year (Doc.50). Obviously, the walls to support them stood. In 1447, on 25th July, Lodovico wrote to the commissario of Revere, instructing him to pay the "maestri e bombarderi (chi) lavorano al palazzo nostro li" according to their needs, out of the funds collected as customs duty (Doc.53). Unless the distinction so clearly made by Schivenoglia and Filarete between palace and castle was not, at this time, made by Lodovico (as it was in the copy letter of 31st January, 1448 (Doc.54)), it is difficult to imagine what job could have been done at the palace by makers of defence works. Perhaps they worked on an inner ring of defence of which there now exists no trace. It may be remarked that a confusion about what was castle and what was palace could have existed at the time when the old towers and their linking wall were being

incorporated into the palace. Then, some unspecified work was done in the middle of 1448. Lodovico wrote on 20th July informing the vicar that an official would arrive at Revere on the following day with money to give to the bricklayers (Doc.55). On 17th February, 1449, a letter to the vicar referred to work on the interior of, almost certainly, the palace. The floor of the 'guardacamera' had been laid but paving was to be delayed until the fire-places of that room and the 'camareta' had been installed (Doc.58). Materials needed for the hanging of ceilings are what seem to have been requested in a letter of 31st July, 1449, to Albertino Pavesi, Lodovico's treasurer (Doc.61).⁹⁴ In July, rooms of the first floor, if not of a higher one, must have been the scene of activity. Schivenoglia referred to the building of a wall to the castle on the river side in this year.⁹⁵

The documents do not make clear whether work followed a definite plan or was of a piece-meal nature and its purpose merely to make firm and habitable an older building. However, some time before about 1450, a plan almost certainly did exist to convert the old complex of structures into a grandiose palace as tall as, and probably more extensive than, the present building. A piano nobile would have been part of this plan. The tall, towered north facade was part of the plan. However, proposals did not necessarily include provision of the carved window frames and the front door. They may enliven a facade originally intended to have a different character; the decision to introduce them having been made shortly after the building campaign was begun and walls to the north of the old towers were yet

raised to an inconsiderable height - above the level of the lowest terracotta-framed windows on the flanks of the towers.



2. Some Remarks on Lodovico's Early Patronage of the Visual Arts.

There was probably a plan of some kind for the building before 1450. However, it is doubtful that the full-scale building campaign that anticipated the palace, having the specific character that it has now, was in progress in 1449. Doubts are raised because, supposing the building to have made use of earlier structures, a plan to reorganise the building radically, both in terms of its details and its spaces in and around the courtyard, would have to have existed. Now, the nature of the reorganisation that did take place supposes not only the presence of a designer capable of and motivated to conceive it (a question that will be discussed below), but also, in Lodovico, an appreciation of the merit of the designer's ideas before advice was offered and accepted. Acceptance forced alterations to earlier parts. The ordered placing of windows on the east and west facades was achieved at the expense of consistency. The construction of the courtyard porticos resulted in damage being done to older parts and in some stylistic and structural anomalies.

Changing a design is anticipated by a sense of the desirability of that change. It is therefore necessary to ask what may have predisposed Lodovico to seek and accept changes: to identify, if possible, the character of objects that elicited his approval before change was desirable or, at least, while his attitudes remained ambivalent.

There is some reason to doubt Lodovico's readiness, in the early years of his rule, to appreciate the architecture of

which Revere is, in its mid-fifteenth century parts, an example. Filarete, in his Trattati, said as much. He saw it as no easy matter for a prince to rid himself of prejudices in favour of the 'modern' or 'gothic' style. Lodovico, who exemplified for him the enlightened patron of architecture, he saw as no exception. Although, in the early 1460s, Lodovico satisfied him as being especially knowledgeable - especially in architecture⁹⁶ - Filarete gave him a speech after a visit to the tower with Francesco Sforza, in which the prince, in an almost religious tone, confessed that, in the beginning, he followed the manner of his father. In attributing to Lodovico the zeal of the convert to the 'ancient' style, Filarete wrote, surely, not without a view to his own advantage or to his knowledge of Lodovico's patronage of architecture. He identified the palace at Revere as one built in the 'ancient' style.⁹⁷ However, the period of its construction in the 15th century seems to have spanned two phases of Lodovico's architectural education.

The general character of Lodovico's patronage of the visual arts is difficult to describe because of the shortage of surviving objects. Exceptionally, the palace at Revere survives. A list of names of artists employed during the early years of his marquisate, however, implies the same ambivalence that the palace bespeaks. It includes Pisanello, Angelo da Siena, Belbello da Pavia, Michele Ungaro perhaps, and Donatello.

The date of the Sala del Pisanello and the question whether it was Lodovico's or Gian Francesco's commission remain disputed points.⁹⁸ Nonetheless, it either represents

Lodovico's taste at the beginning of his rule or else hints at the artistic ambience upon which he imposed, in the manner Baxendall proposes,⁹⁹ a fashionable taste for classical heroes and classicizing forms. In any case, a sudden and decisive replacement of values found in Pisanello's work did not take place. The towered and crenellated palace at Revere does not unequivocally reject the values of the Sala del Pisanello. So, Lodovico's adoption of the ancient style for the carved details at Revere did not immediately exclude the possibility of such work as Pisanello's continuing to enjoy his favour. Indeed, his employment of other painters tends to confirm the point. Belbello da Pavia, the miniaturist who, after Mantegna's arrival in the Mantovano and on his advice, was replaced as illustrator of Barbara of Brandenburg's missal by the more 'Mantegnesque' Gerolamo da Cremona, had decorated a book for Lodovico that, in 1451, was described as "molto bello e ornatissimo". It was a gift from the King of Aragon, but Belbello had also worked for the Gonzaga in 1448 - on a missal for Gian Lucido.¹⁰⁰

A letter of 29th March, 1452, reveals that a certain Angelo da Siena was at work in the Mantovano. (Doc. 112). This is probably the same Angelo da Siena who worked for the Este from 1449 with Cosimo Tura at Belfiore.¹⁰¹

Longhi provided Angelo with an oeuvre. He supposed the painter to have been educated in a 'gothic' environment.¹⁰² Angelo's work, now betraying a debt to northern Italian painting, is yet eclectic, now carrying, as in the Virtues - probably among his later works - allusions to the work of painters like Mantegna

and Tura. Work done for the Gonzaga would, if Longhi's attributions are correct, have been by a painter lacking a strong individual personality and without a decisive vision of his models. He may have been capable of confirming Lodovico in a taste for the sort of work, it may be assumed, he did at Ferrara - work like that of Tura and Galasso - but it is unlikely that he would, alone, be capable of effecting a reorientation of Lodovico's taste. It is indeed arguable that he would ever have wanted to.

In employing Donatello, Lodovico dealt with an artist the broad orientation of whose style is sure. Donatello agreed to work on the arca of St. Anselm, sending statues and other objects in May and June, 1450.¹⁰³ However, his works have not been identified. In view of the fact that Lodovico was interested in acquiring the services of Belbello¹⁰⁴ and Michele Ungaro¹⁰⁵ after then, the effect of the appearance of Donatello's work in the Mantovano does not appear to have given rise to an exclusiveness in Lodovico's attitude to classicizing Tuscan work. In the early years of his rule, Lodovico was not a determined propagandist on behalf of recent developments in Tuscany - or the local and north Italian traditions. The palace at Revere documents his continuing ambivalence in the 1450s at the same time as pointing to his developing approval of the classicizing style. It seems reasonable to suggest that in the first years of his marquise Lodovico adopted the artistic traditions of his own and surrounding territories and that classicizing values insinuated themselves at first only gradually.

Tradition and innovation could co-exist during this

interregnum, for neither are absolute phenomena. On the one hand, classical memories existed within traditions and retrieving classical traditions was partly a process of selection from within traditions that might, themselves, appear anti-classical. For example, the bell of S. Andrea, cast in 1444, was decorated with four figures - Atlas, Hercules, Pallas and Adam. The first three did not, probably, look much like antique statues of figures of mythology, for each figure was accompanied by an identifying inscription.¹⁰⁶ But the personages if not the precise visual imagery existed in popular imagination. On the other hand, the recovery of classical material could represent an innovation that yet gave rise to sentimental response different only in its object from that of the Sala del Pisanello. Pisanello himself, though his work as a painter exemplifies the courtly High Middle Ages from today's viewpoint, was not un-interested in the Roman past, as some of his drawings and his medals show. And Mantegna, careful student of inscriptions and antique remains, belongs, along with Pisanello, in a descriptive-evocative rather than a formal tradition of painting. Vittorino da Feltre's teaching was similarly accommodating. Its purpose being the lay student's preparation for the active Christian life, it was not different, fundamentally, from the instruction contained in the Romances. As the Romances gave instruction to the aristocratic warrior, Vittorino gave scholarly instruction to the not necessarily aristocratic and not necessarily military layman. If such a man as Palla Strozzi could commission a work of Gentile da Fabriano, it is unlikely that Lodovico would have felt inhibited about

employing Pisanello as his father had done and as Leonello d'Este had done. If fashion, changed since his father's time, would have dictated his actions, Lodovico, in the 40s and 50s, was leisurely in following it. Only gradually, it seems, did a taste for the 'ancient' style - the essential formal constituent of a classical revival - usurp the place in his affections of work of which his father would have approved. But in his 'classical' education and in his experience of the works of Donatello and other Tuscan masters lay the basis for a developing enthusiasm that would tend to exclude the heroes and forms of recent, local artistic production.

The survival, in the palace at Revere, of forms that may be associated readily with buildings of his father's time is most simply explained by the suggestion that, as Filarete wrote, Lodovico first followed his father's example. The alternative suggestion that those forms date to Gian Francesco's period is neither confirmed nor refuted by documentary evidence. However, it appears to be the case that when the decision was made to raise the building to its present height, and the towers and north curtin wall were begun, windows of the 'old' type were opened in the lower flanks of the towers. Later, planning and design decisions showed less respect for the old window type.

The redesigner, or redesigners, of the stone-carved details and the courtyard plan and elevation was obviously aware of events in Florence. However, researches in the Mantuan State Archive fail to produce sure evidence of the activity of a Tuscan architect in the Mantovano before about 1450.¹⁰⁷ Relations between Mantua and Florence were not always close. From the

middle of May, 1446, until early in 1447, when Lodovico became Captain General of the Florentine army (Doc. 51), Mantua and Florence were at war. ¹⁰⁸

3. The Courtyard

The palace at Revere, itself not an unambiguous building from the stylistic point of view, represents an equivocating attitude towards the style that Filarete evangelised. While work continued on the palace, a total replacement of local forms by Florentine ones did not occur. The survival of 'old' elements in the 'new' building - the fact that traditional crenellations waited to trim the palace for example - suggests that Lodovico, when he decided to follow the new design or designs, was not profoundly dissatisfied with them. They retained appropriateness in some way. Only the gist of what Filarete said about Lodovico and his father's style is true. Filarete implied that Lodovico's conversion to the 'ancient' style was quite sudden and quite counter to his father's practice. While the palace is, as Filarete said, a classicizing building, it is also indicative of Lodovico's continuing attachment to forms of traditional local building.

The work of paving rooms, the installation of fireplaces and the hanging of ceilings could have been done anywhere in the lower parts of the building in the late 40s and early 50s, but most likely in the north wing. The palace, as it stands today, is finished in different parts to different degrees. Towards the north-west, where all the window frames are of stone, the building is most finished. Stone frames are also found on the west flank of the north-west tower (Fig. 35). At the east end of the north facade, the tower's window frames are of less durable and less painstakingly worked terracotta (Fig. 36). On the side of the east tower, intonaco is used to simulate stone framed windows - or at least suggest their outlines. The intonaco is

new but may imitate earlier simulated frames (Fig. 37). As has been seen, the fourth, south wing is missing and the east wing is only half-built. Evidently, work concentrated upon the north end of the building and petered out towards the south. Early building work referred to in documents, especially if it is on named rooms, will almost certainly have been done there.

The number of surviving documents for 1450 tends to confirm what Schivenoglia wrote. Much building work seems to have been done. A letter of 18th April 1450, to the Rectors of Verona, refers to the building of a stone staircase "... per questa nostra stancia" (Doc.64). But a more important concern of the time, from the point of view of the student of the building's history, involved columns. The columns mentioned, on 18th May, 1450, can only have been for the courtyard. Albertino de Pavesi was instructed to advise Lorenzo 'tagliapietra'¹⁰⁹ to send pieces of iron for the filing and polishing of columns (Doc.66). Another letter, of 18th July, 1450, to Albertino, contained the order to send a file "per rasticare preda" (Doc.72). However, it is probable that in this case bricks rather than stone, normally called 'preda viva', were to be filed.¹¹⁰ The joiner, Gian Antonio, was to be instructed, on 18th May, to send a column-raising apparatus. The columns, monoliths of Verona marble, were very nearly finished and ready to be raised. Possibly, they were roughed out at Verona and were sent down to Revere. Unfinished, they would have been safer from damage while in transit.

Shortly before 18th May, another letter was written, to the Rectors of Verona. On 26th April, 1450, Lorenzo - the same

Lorenzo who knew what was required for the polishing of the columns, and had already been employed by Gian Francesco Gonzaga to carve columns for Marmiolo (Doc. 191, 195) - was in Verona to buy marble from a certain Zanino da Bergamo "... pro quodam ... laborerio", but, as a result of a disagreement, was taken to court (Doc. 65). Unfortunately, the quantity and form of the marble for the unidentified work are not specified. The letter of 18th May was probably written too soon after that of 26th April for it to be likely that, on the first occasion, Lorenzo was negotiating the sale and delivery of columns. Besides, a letter of 20th May 1450 shows that Lorenzo was responsible for the transportation of stone - perhaps marble - from Mantua to Revere, where it would be used for door-surrounds or steps (Doc. 68).¹¹¹ This stone would be more likely that referred to on 26th April if there is significance in Lorenzo being concerned with it. The correspondence of 1450 does not, then, help to date the columns precisely. However, it is unlikely that they had been ordered many years before 1450. They had not been used before Lodovico used them, for they remained to be filed. Probably, they had been delivered on site recently. Bases, if not necessarily capitals, had been carved for the columns it was proposed to raise with the apparatus.

The courtyard arrangement is unusual. It is contained on three sides by arcades. Single rows of columns are used at the sides, and the north arcade uses columns doubled, one behind another. The arches are round and the intercolumniation is the same throughout. There are five arches in the north arcade and

seven at each of the sides. Half-columns at the ends of the arcades are applied to short lengths of masonry that form the corners of the open court. Arcuation is uniform in the elevations of the arcades. However, the covered spaces of the side porticoes differ from the space of the north portico. The shallow side porticoes are covered by short barrel vaults springing from lintels resting on the capitals of the columns and sunk into the backing walls. The north portico is deep. It measures seven bays by two. It is covered by a lunette vault springing from the imposts of the northern row of columns and corbel capitals set into the back and side walls.

The provision of the arcaded courtyard is to be associated with the grandiose plan to raise the building to its present height and create a piano nobile at the 14br. level. However, columns, bases and capitals, all of Verona marble, have a style and proportion that make them fit uneasily with the present courtyard arrangement and with some of its other details. The fascie of the arches of the arcades are shallowly carved of a yellowish stone, with a flat narrow band containing a cyma moulding which in turn contains two broad flat bands, the outer raised slightly above the profile of the inner. They are curved architraves composed of only two elements (Fig. 38) instead of the more conventional arrangement of brick voussoirs with terracotta archivolt course above. Arches with profiles similar to those at Revere are found in buildings by Brunelleschi, Michelozzo and others.¹¹² Corbel capitals at the back of the deep north loggia (Figs. 39, 40) are carved of a material like that of the arch fascie. They are indebted

to Tuscan examples (Fig. 41), and contrast sharply in style with the column capitals whose foliate decoration is cabbage-like or holly-like (Figs. 38, 42). The columns and capitals are clearly of northern Italian workmanship. They are examples of a type which was not favoured over a brief period, but continued to be used in the first half of the 15th century and later. Capitals quite similar in style are to be found in Venice, in the Loggia Foscara, finished in 1462.¹¹³ In Mantua itself, similar capitals are plentiful. One that is very close to them in character and quality of workmanship was found in the Rio - the stream that bisects the city - and so, unfortunately, cannot be dated.¹¹⁴ Two of the capitals used in the portico of the house of Giovanni Boniforte, and therefore to be dated before 1455,¹¹⁵ are also similar.

The Gonzaga arms are carved on eight half-columns at Revere. The Imperial eagles are quartered by a St. George's cross at the centre of which is a shield bearing, in three cases, the Gonzaga bands alone and, in the other five cases, the Gonzaga bands quartered with the lions of Bohemia.

As early as 1395, Francesco IV 'Capitano' was interested in acquiring the title of marquis or duke,¹¹⁶ and already, in 1394, the emperor Wenceslaus had conferred privileges including the right to include the lions.¹¹⁷ In 1433, Gian Francesco received the Imperial investiture as marquis.¹¹⁸ He was entitled to carry the arms of the Holy Roman Emperor: "Videlicet crucem rubeam in campo albo et quatuor aquilas nigras alis extensis et flammeis pennis".¹¹⁹ The capitals must post-date Gian Francesco's

investiture as marquis.¹²⁰ Lodovico, who took power on the death of his father, was not confirmed as marquis until August 1445.¹²¹ Neither stylistic nor heraldic evidence allow the capitals to be dated with precision.

The stylistic discontinuities of the courtyard suggest that the columns, capitals and bases were ordered before the corbel capitals and voussoirs. The latter show clear stylistic links with Tuscan examples and may be associated with the choice of vaulting system for the north loggia (Fig. 45) - again typical of contemporary Tuscan practice.¹²² If the capitals and the corbels had been produced at the same time (and for the sake of the present arrangement), would not the designer of the latter have issued instructions regarding the form of the former? It should be noted that it was possible to produce two "Brunelleschian" capitals of Verona marble before 1455 for the portico of the house of Giovanni Boniforte (Fig. 46). However, the columns and capitals cannot have been carved a long time before the decision to lay out the courtyard in the present arrangement, if they were originally intended for Revere. That they needed to be polished and filed suggests that they were new in 1450. They can only have been ordered when a grandiose plan existed for the raising and extending of earlier structures.

As has been seen, such a plan seems to have existed around 1450, when the lower stretches of the walls of the north wing were probably built; that is, prior to the installation of stone-carved window frames. The bevel-recessed windows with terracotta framing mouldings of the lower flanks of the towers

are stylistically continuous with the other, probably earlier, stretches of similarly fenestrated wall in the side wings. However, the brickwork in which they are found appears to be continuous with the north facade and with the upper walls of the towers with stone-carved windows. The windows of the lower levels of the facade are stylistically discontinuous with those of the lower flanks of the towers. These observations indicate that it was first intended to build the north wing of the palace in a manner consistent with the side wings but that a change was made in favour of the facade fenestration while work was in progress. It is possible that this change accompanied a change in proposals regarding the layout of the courtyard. Arching and vaulting are stylistically discontinuous with the columns and capitals. Were they all ordered for the sake of a single plan for the courtyard? The question is whether the placing of the columns should be associated with the present vaulting and arching or with the building before that intervention. If the original placing of the columns is the present one, but there was to be no vaulting, there would be no need to double the columns, for the north row would not have been load-bearing. If the stylistic discontinuity is significant, it could indicate that the columns were originally intended to be placed differently from the way they are placed today. The columns would have been ordered for a different configuration. Two plans for the courtyard - and the same would apply to the decorative treatment of the north facade - would have followed one another very closely. It seems likely that this is the case.

The courtyard not only possesses stylistically disparate elements but also contains structural and spatial anomalies. They, more than stylistic considerations, suggest that there were two plans for the courtyard. The porticoes are quite obviously ill-adapted to the walls of the east and west wings. The two northern-most vaults of the east portico, for example, cut across the windows of the backing wall (Fig. 47). The present layout of columns and arches does not take account of the earlier fenestrated walls of the wings, whilst some openings seem to have been made with a view to the layout (See Pocket Drawings 1, 4). At the west entrance (the corresponding east entrance has been bricked up (Fig. 48)), the narrow span of the vault of the portico leaves the lintels, from which the vault springs, only partly supported by the courtyard wall (Fig. 49). And the access seems to have been narrowed by a header at each side in order that support be provided to the lintels (Fig. 50). It seems unlikely that a designer (who, as will be seen, gives evidence of his ingenuity in other aspects of the courtyard design) would both order the columns and propose a layout that was going to produce such problems. Both difficulties mentioned so far could have been avoided if taller columns had been ordered, if pedestals or cloister parapets had been provided or if the courtyard pavement had been raised: the apices of the arches come well below the level of the piano nobile.¹²³

Other unusual features of the present design may be noted. The columns of the north loggia are doubled but not paired (Fig. 51). Presumably, the carvers did not know that their columns were

going to be arranged as they are now. The heights of the columns and arches do not relate to the intercolumniation. The columns are 8br. high while the intercolumniation is $53\frac{1}{3}\text{br.}^{124}$ - the distance between the side wings - divided by 7 - the number of arcuations of the north portico. The length, $(53\frac{1}{3} \div 7)\text{br.}$, is unavoidably difficult to deal with arithmetically, but the choice of column height does not mitigate the problem of relating ground plan measurements to elevation measurements. The observation strengthens the argument that the column-placer did not give instructions regarding the heights of columns. Column bases do not relate to intercolumniation either. Bases measure $1\frac{1}{2}\text{br.}$ That divides into $53\frac{1}{3}\text{br.}$ but, because 7 does not divide into that number, intercolumniations cannot be expressed in column bases. Of course, the placing of axes of regular sculptural forms like columns is more important than the whereabouts of their exterior surfaces except in a rigorously tectonic architecture, but again, the column-placer, who was not careless of simple proportioning in other parts of his plan, as will be seen, seems not to have given detailed instructions to the carvers.

Two different vaulting systems are used - short barrel vaults for the side porticos (Fig. 52) and a sail vault for the north portico (Fig. 45) - and, because arcuation is the same throughout, different heights are attained. The side vaults reach their apices well below the floor level of the piano nobile. The north vault seems to rise higher. But if, indeed, it does, the subsidiary soffits must meet the principal vault at obtuse angles (Fig. 53). The building of such a vault requires considerable improvisational

ability.

It is because the depths of the bays differ between the sides and the north that different vaulting systems had to be used. The north portico is four times as deep as the side porticos.¹²⁵ It is two whole intercolumniations deep from backing wall to near edge of column plinth. The side porticos are a half-intercolumniation deep, similarly measured. However, the length of the north portico is not a whole number of intercolumniations. It measures 7 intercolumniations minus a brick's length at each end of the space where the walls are thickened - or $1\frac{1}{3}$ braccia.

Although the ground plan proportions are related in depth, and in length insofar as the intercolumniar scansion is uniform, very different spaces are created. Whilst the north portico contains a single, ample space, providing shelter and shade, the side porticos are too open and shallow to be useful for those purposes. Their 'raison d'être', was not a functional one - at least at that level. Access from the north loggia to the east loggia is closed. To the west loggia it is ungainly. The narrow arched opening at the end of the north loggia obscures the differently vaulted west loggia. It gives onto the short space behind the arcade corner masonry. The space is covered by a short and low (too low - (Fig. 54)) barrel vault that runs at right angles to the direction of the vaults of the side portico bays, and buttresses the wall running east-west above the north arcade. The north arcade wall is further buttressed by walls, continuing its direction in the side wings. In the west wing, where it has been possible to take measurements, that wall is unusual in being only three headers thick instead of the four or more in the rest of the

building at ground level.¹²⁶ It is possible that it was built later than the other walls of the three wings, at the time when the columns of the north portico were put in place. However, a wall only two headers thick and therefore inefficient as a buttress to the wall above the east arcade and no wall at all continuing the line of the west arcade wall are found in the space above the north portico.¹²⁷ If one wall was a brave economy and the other was a bold omission, no unfortunate results appear to have followed. The side walls above the arcades show no signs of uneven settling (Figs. 52, 57), and it would, perhaps, be unjust to attribute the cracking of the north arcade wall to its inability to absorb the thrust of the side walls above the arches. The wall above the north arcade is unusual for other reasons. First, the elevation bears no relation with the intercolumniation. Windows are not placed with regard to the whereabouts of strong and weak points of the arcuation. Second, the strength of the arcades' corner masonry, that would have lent itself to an Urbino-like solution, is made superfluous by the placing of the windows uncomfortably close to the corners. The windows, it will be seen, are placed to follow a discipline active on piano nobile level but not directly implied by the column placement. The third point is of a more purely aesthetical-critical kind: the north loggia appears to be in danger of being crushed by the weighty expanse of masonry above up to the line of the window sills. Arches give the quality of massiveness even to unrelieved and membranous wall: their volume and vertical force always run the risk of being overwhelmed by too great an area/mass of the material above.

In the palace, the arches are too low and the windows are placed too high (Fig. 56). At the related palace at Motteggiana, the loggia in the courtyard is stylistically homogeneous in most respects, and the height of the columns is related more satisfactorily to the area of masonry above up to the level of the windows (Fig. 58). At Revere, the piano nobile is too high for the columns and arches, but at Motteggiana (and in the cloisters of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, in Mantua (Fig. 59)) the arches fulfil their implied function of supporting the beams of the floor.

On the one hand, these anomalies result from prior conditions: the distance between the side wings was already established, and the columns were, it is argued, already available to the designer of the courtyard. On the other hand, the present arrangement, with its unusual and often unsatisfactory features, fulfils certain requirements.

The principal achievements of the present arrangement are the provision of corridors, of not wastefully broad proportions, giving access to the rooms of the side wings, and a large habitable area above the north portico. The doubling of the columns gave the north arcade the capability of withstanding the lateral thrust of the vault¹²⁸ - or the northern row narrowed the space to be vaulted. Doubling of columns is found quite frequently in cloisters¹²⁹ and in Romanesque church architecture.¹³⁰ Colonnets rather than columns are used in those cases, so the effect is usually less monumental. The solution at Revere may also have recommended itself to a designer who recalled the churches of S. Costanza in Rome and S. Maria Maggiore at Nocera (where

there are no impost blocks or architraves). But the solution remains unusual in palace architecture.

There may have been another good reason to double the columns - one not imitative of other examples. It would have followed from the desire to create the habitable space above. The thickening, by two headers, of each of the end walls of the north loggia, could be associated with the same intention (though, as will be seen below, that thickening is to be associated primarily with the construction of the vault). To establish the depth of the space above the north portico, the designer seems to have used the length of the loggia itself. He seems to have wanted the space to approach a simple proportion of length to breadth and to have disliked the factors of 40 (the number of plinths or bases that measure the length of the space above the north portico and between the wings). Indeed, the factors of 40 are not very useful. He may have considered 2:5 (a room of $21\frac{1}{3}$ br. by $53\frac{1}{3}$ br., where a plinth measures $1\frac{1}{3}$ br.) or 5:8 (a room of $33\frac{1}{3}$ br. by $53\frac{1}{3}$ br.). But in both cases, the vault below would have spanned a very wide space. Moreover, such a vault's width could not have been integrated with the intercolumniation of the arcades ($53\frac{1}{3}$ / 7br. or 7br. 7br. "c.). By the introduction of $2\frac{1}{3}$ br. - a brick's length - of wall at the ends of the space under the vault, the distance between the wings was reduced from $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. to 52br., or from 40 plinths to 39 - a number divisible by three.

It should be noted that, whereas on the level between the piano nobile and the area under the roof the width of the southern part of the north wing is $26'4\frac{1}{2}"$ c. (8.039m.), the distance at ground level between the back wall of the loggia and the rear edge of the

south row of column plinths is 25'1"c. (7.645m.). Therefore, between ground level and the top floor, the wall bisecting the wing is stepped back. A comparison of the plans of the ground level (Fig. 17) and the piano nobile (Fig. 55) reveals that the back wall of the space above the north portico is thinner and is of the same thickness as the other principal walls of the building. It is therefore four headers thick, or about 2'1" (0.635m.).

The distance between the north wing dividing wall and the wall above the north arcade is very close to $17\frac{1}{3}$ br. which is one third of 52 br. So, the space approaches the proportion of one to three. However, $17\frac{1}{3}$ br. was not a multiple of any of the factors of 40 (plinths) that would have been suitable for the intercolumniation. Instead, the distance $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. was divided by seven. Two intercolumniations given for the depth of the north loggia make up a distance of 15 br. 2br"c. About 2br. 2br." is left over to make that breadth up to $17\frac{1}{3}$ br., and would have to be filled in at ground level. The northern line of columns occupies slightly more than 16 br." The back wall of the loggia may have been thickened at the time of the placing of the columns, for, measured at the north entrance doorway, it is thicker than others in the palace, at about $3'4\frac{3}{4}"$ (1.035m.) instead of 2'4" (0.61m.). The difference of about 16" (0.406m.) is, in Mantuan inches, about $10\frac{1}{2}$. ($10\frac{1}{2}$ br." plus 16 br." is 2br. $2\frac{1}{2}$ br."). The northern line of columns contains an area that is approximately expressible in intercolumniations. However, it is important to note that the loggia is two whole intercolumniations deep while it is seven intercolumniations long minus two brick's lengths. Evidently,

the designer wanted to broaden the space beyond the simple 2 by 7 proportion. This would have been for the sake of the space above. The southern row of columns marks the limit of an area one third as deep as the length of the area below.¹³¹

The thickening of the walls bounding the north loggia has been explained in connection with the needs of the space above. However, it may also be explained in terms of a more pressing (though still associated) need to provide support for the vaulting. As has been seen, the back wall of the north loggia is stepped back at higher levels. Similarly, the length of the space under the vault is reduced. On the level above the piano nobile the corridor running between the old tower walls is 81'11"c. long (24.968m.). Under the vault, the distance between the end walls is about 79'2" (24.13m.). The end walls, then, are also stepped back above the ground floor level. It is likely that thickening was added to existing walls at the back and sides of the portico. The lower reaches of the side walls were at one time external. With machicolations above, they should have been plumb.¹³² The tower-joining wall would also have been external.

If the old boundary walls rose higher than the springing level of the proposed vault, some thickening would have been necessary in order that the vault be provided with support. The wall-thickening would be associated specifically with the decision to vault. The arches of the vault spring from the added widths of wall bounding the portico area.

60 Figure ⁶⁰39 shows schematically that if the vault had been built in a totally uniform manner, following from the regular

placing of the columns, wall-thickening would have been necessary. That thickening would have been half the width of the imposts of the vault. The problem to be solved is that the axis of the supporting element (at Revere, the vault impost at the angle of the space) cannot locate the walls running at right angles to where it is situated without difficulties arising above. The drawing shows that twin groins would rise from corner imposts. The area of vault between would have to pass from v-shaped to almost flat at its zenith. Simple division of lengths of spaces to be vaulted, without regard to impost widths, results in unequal lunette widths.

In fact, at Revere, a solution more improvised than the regular one is to be found. As has been seen, the length of the space is seven intercolumniations minus a half-plinth, or a brick's length, at each end, while the depth of the space is two whole intercolumniations. The reduction of the length by a half-plinth, instead of half the vault impost (probably for ease of construction), means that the lunettes at the ends of the north and south sides have shorter diameters than those intervening. And, because the width of the space is two whole intercolumniations, the lunettes at the short sides have longer spans than the others. Consequently, groins at the corners of the space do not meet at exact right angles. However, these irregularities are not eye-catching.

The portico space is 'stretched' widthways - being two intercolumniations deep. Since it seems reasonable to consider the thickening of the side walls, and the back wall too, as support for the vault, the stretching of the width of the space would be

explained as the outcome of a desire to displace the north loggia arcade to the south and thus establish the present width for the space above. At the same time, another end was achieved in the near-symmetry of the arcades' corner masonry. The fact that the north loggia backing wall was not thickened more may be explained as an economic measure.

Consideration of the interests of the space above the north portico finds justification for other anomalies in the courtyard. As has been said, the fenestration of the north side appears ill-adapted (Fig. 56). But it seems to have been chosen primarily for the sake of its appearance from the inside. The windows are 4'7" (1.397m.) wide. That is three braccia. They are separated, it seems, by ten braccia of brickwork. The extreme windows would be five and two thirds braccia from the end walls for the whole distance of fifty-three and one third braccia to be accounted for. The clarity of the window arrangement over-rode the clearly less-pressing need for a relationship between intercolumniation and fenestration. The side loggie, that for other reasons could not have been deepened to make them more useful covered spaces,¹³³ could neither have been deepened if the placing of the windows above the north arcade was to be maintained, for they would have cut across the windows at left and right. The windows of the side wings are placed alternately over apices and imposts of arches. Their axes, then, are one and a half intercolumniations apart. The windows above the side entrances are placed in line with the apices of the arches, and other windows are placed accordingly. Evidently, the desire for a certain uniformity in the courtyard

facades was important: the windows of the side wings are wasted as features to dignify interior spaces. They light corridors.

Another achievement of the courtyard design is formal-aesthetic. Being like those mentioned, the outcome of a problem-solving activity because of the constraints upon freedom of invention imposed by earlier structural factors and members, it suggests the lines of an earlier, and it seems to have been thought, less satisfactory arrangement. The courtyard has, till now, been described as the outcome of two principal intentions. One, positive, was the provision of the space above the north portico. The other, following very much upon the requirements of the space and therefore the outcome of a less actively affirmative intention, was the provision of the narrow corridors above the side arcades. But both the depth of the north portico and the shallowness of the side porticos help achieve this formal-aesthetic purpose. (It should be noted that an over-riding concern was not stylistic - the creation of a 'Tuscan' courtyard - for, in that case, the columns would have been unwelcome intrusions). The present arrangement makes the open space of the courtyard more nearly approach a square than the whole area contained by the walls of the wings. The whole courtyard space, if it was intended to be symmetrical about the centres of the side entrances, as the placing of the side arcades at present indicates, would have measured $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. by 96 br.¹³⁴ - a ratio of 1:1.8. The area now circumscribed by the arcades is the intercolumniation, 139.5" c. (3.543 m.) by 7 plus 96" c. (or 2.438 m. - twice the length of the corner masonry visible from the inside of the courtyard) by 139.5" times 5 plus 96" c. -

a ratio of 1:1.35. A regular ambulatory of square bays running round four sides would have made the uncovered space of the courtyard narrower, proportionally, than the space contained by the walls of the wings, because the area is rectangular as opposed to square.

Different vaulting systems being used at the north and sides, the architectonic interpretation of the columns is not constant. Nevertheless, the sides of the courtyard are similarly arcuated, and a certain visual unity is given. The achievement of a visual unity in porticos of such differing proportions was not an unimportant purpose of the designer, for otherwise, the side arcades could have been replaced by walls. Indeed, it is perhaps worth remarking in passing that columns may have been used at east and west because they were available. It is questionable whether a designer could have justified the expense of columns when he proposed such mean spaces. At any rate, the visitor who stands under the north portico sees the identical arches running round the courtyard before he comprehends the narrowness of the space to which the porticos are adapted. The arcades' corner masonry inhibits an immediate comprehension of the distance of the side loggie from the north, and makes sure that the relationships of placing of the three loggie are discovered only with difficulty. The covered spaces acquire an autonomy at Revere. Where arcades are turned on ~~single~~ columns, as in cloisters, bays serve as measures of limited space. The visitor at Revere is not encouraged to move and explore the relationships of the loggie. There is no access at the east, and that at the west is narrow.

Awareness of the side loggie is not powerful and immediate. Like the world viewed through a window, the spaces of the side porticos have a visual existence that is denied the support of data supplied by the other senses, and their absolute existence is qualified, like pictorial experience. This qualified reality causes them to fall back from the forefront of the visitor's attention, and the open space of the courtyard achieves a certain balance. The effect is achieved by the bulk of the doubled columns, the corner masonry and the difficulty of access to the side porticos. The north loggia is a gently enclosing space.

The arrangement that exists today in the courtyard of the palace seems, in part, to be the result of an attempt to exploit the possibilities offered. Some of the 'rough edges' were justified by the designer's intention to broaden the space, and others by his intention to provide the spaces above the porticos. His solution was ingenious. Other problems were created by the columns that were ordered before he drew his plans. So serious-minded seems to have been his attempt to broaden the space of the courtyard, so much must an earlier and probably simpler invention, using the columns, have been unsatisfactory in his view. He was apparently determined to avoid the effect of a coulisse. It seems reasonable to wonder if the arrangement that his replaced would not have created a long, narrow space.

4, Possible Earlier Courtyard Arrangements

Assuming that the earlier designer ordered the columns, he knew what he was going to do with them. He cannot have intended that they be paired along the north side of the courtyard - what was variety in individual columns is inconsistency in pairs of them. Therefore, his arrangement would have involved rows of single columns. As has been seen, single rows of columns could not be placed on any of the lines on which columns are found now without disturbing results.¹³⁵ The present intercolumniation - $11'7\frac{1}{2}"$ c. or 3.543m. - cannot be fitted a whole number of times into the space between the centre of the side door and the back of the north loggia (72' or 21.946m.) without the introduction of large stretches of masonry at the arcade corners. So, the line of the north arcade could not have been intended to be moved north, and a circuit of square bays of the length of the present intercolumniation could not have been proposed. Using the present intercolumniation, the side bays would, with a maximum depth, have been square, and the north loggia would have been about 19'9" deep (6.02m.). The introduction of corner masonry would have reduced the depth of all the porticos. An arrangement of bays of equal or similar size would have used a different intercolumniation.

Because of the axial placing of the north entrance, an odd number of bays would have occupied that side. And the axis of the side entrances must coincide with the centre of an intercolumniation of the side arcades. The number seven for the bays of the north portico is not suitable for the above reason.¹³⁶

The number five has the merit of dividing into 40 - the number of plinths that could be fitted into the space between the side wings. Eight plinths would measure the distance from column centre, and the interspace would be seven. Four and a half times such an intercolumniation ($10\frac{2}{3}$ br.) would be 48 br. The measured distance from the back of the north loggia to the centre of the side entrance is 864" c. (21.946m.) - about $14\frac{1}{2}$ " less than the equivalent of 48 br. (By addition, the distance between the axis of the side door and the north wall of the space above the piano nobile over the north loggia is about 876" (22.25m.). Of course, that distance is approximate, and does not take account of the intonaco on the walls of the space above the north loggia). It has already been suggested that the back wall of the north loggia was thickened when the present courtyard's columns were placed. A continuous portico of five bays by nine would have fitted into the space provided.¹³⁷ (Fig. 61). The very rigid modular design that is being hypothesized would also incorporate the heights of columns and arches. The columns, including capitals, bases and plinths, are about 12'3" tall (3.734m.). That is close to 8 br., or 6 column base diameters.¹³⁸ A distance from column centre to column centre of 8 base diameters or plinths and a column height of 6 plinths make sides of a rectangle whose diagonal is 10 plinths. The extrados of a round arch, springing at a height of 6 plinths, would reach its apex at a height of 10 plinths. In braccia, these lengths are 8, $10\frac{2}{3}$ and $13\frac{2}{3}$.¹³⁹

Arches would not have reached their apices well below the 14 br. piano nobile floor level as at present, but would have

fulfilled their proper function of supporting horizontal members. The plinths of the columns are two or three Mantuan inches lower than the loggia pavement: so it would have been possible to lay the beams of the floor of the piano nobile almost directly on top of the arches (Fig. 62).

The corner bays would have been arched if walls continuing the lines of the arcades existed to fulfil a buttressing function. If these arches were to spring no higher than the arches of the arcades, pilasters - or better, half-columns - would have been applied to the backing walls, so that the arches would have spanned 8 plinths and would have marked off the corner bays. The design, then, would require 8 half-columns and 20 columns - the numbers that are used in the present arrangement. The increased height and span of the side arcades would not have caused them to break the lines of the windows and the side entrance (though if the bays were trabeated rather than vaulted there would be no trouble with the walls of the side wings anyway).

However, there is a difficulty with this design which, although not insuperable, should be mentioned and may be enough to suggest that the courtyard was designed rather differently. The bricklayers would have been presented with the tricky task of trying to make four arches, at the corners, spring from single abacuses. Of course, the provision of carved impost blocks would have solved the problem, as would the careful trimming of bricks up to the level at which the soffits of the arches are a full header's length away from the junction of the spandrels.

The problem could be alleviated by inserting masonry at

the corners where the arcades meet - an arrangement more frequently found in the Mantovano, at the monastery of S. Benedetto Po, for example (Fig.63, 140). Arcade corner masonry frees the intercolumniation (of square bays) from a simple arithmetical relationship with the plan dimensions of the space.¹⁴¹ Of course, the insertion of corner masonry and attached half-columns would necessitate a reduction of the intercolumniation. A convenient length might be 10br., for example. Five arches would occupy 50br. of the $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. - the width of the courtyard - leaving $1\frac{2}{3}$ br. to be filled by masonry at each corner. Four and a half times 10br. is 45br. The extreme columns of the side arcades would be 35br. from the centres of the side entrances. Three braccia of in-filling masonry would be needed in the north-south direction. The ratio of 3 to $1\frac{2}{3}$ is equal to the ratio of 9 to 5. (Fig.60). Such arches would rise to 13br. (Fig.63). If the north row was placed at 10br. from the thickened back wall of the north loggia, the corners would be more nearly symmetrical.

However, this second proposal is also not without foreseeable difficulties. It too would demand the placing of pilasters or half-columns against the wings' walls at the corners, if round arches under the porticos were not to rise higher than those of the arcades (though it is perhaps possible that the insertion of corner masonry made corner arches redundant and that the porticos were trabeated throughout). Alternatively, the back wall would be thickened along its whole length and along the short side walls up to a point approximately in line with the bases of the old

towers. Eight half-columns would already be used at the arcade corners and so would not be available to be placed against the walls. Sixteen columns would be used, and it would be necessary to suppose that four - or more if the courtyard was not symmetrical about the side entrances - were ordered later. However, it is not possible to distinguish two groups of columns with any confidence and therefore provide circumstantial evidence that two separate orders for them were issued. Three different kinds of base are found and all the columns of the north row of the deep portico differ from the others used in the courtyard in lacking, below their lower astragals, a very shallow raised band. These differences, however, are not sufficiently striking to be so simply explained. Another difficulty with this proposal is that it does not entirely solve the problem of the previous one. If the arcades ran right up to the walls - that is, there were five arches running east-west and nine arches running north-south - the arches isolating the corner bays would still run into one another and create practical difficulties at impost level.

While the first proposal has the charm of great simplicity, the second has the merit of resembling the cloisters at S. Benedetto Po. Both present difficulties of a practical nature, but it seems likely that either the one - because of its rigid proportioning and simplicity, either unalterably correct or quite wrong - or the other - because of its more improvised nature, capable of alteration to avoid some difficulties - was originally proposed. Both designs escape the problems of the present courtyard as they are listed above.

But the present courtyard design, as well as making provisions that the old design did not conceive, avoids problems that the old design would have created. A courtyard of equal or nearly-equal bays would not provide the large habitable space above the north portico and the corridors above the side porticos. The ordering of the columns may be associated with the intention to introduce a high piano nobile and raise the building to its present height. The space of the courtyard, as originally proposed, would have been both long and tall. It would have been a chilly space.

5. Luca Fancelli and the Palace at Revere.

Traditionally, the mid-15th century design work at the palace is attributed to Luca Fancelli, whose activity in the Mantovano is first documented in a copy-letter to the Vicar of Revere, of 24th June 1451 (Doc. 92). Some commentators, however, disagree.¹⁴² The Vicar was instructed to pay Luca's expenses. His arrival appears to have been quite recent. In 1491, he wrote to Francesco Gonzaga, Lodovico's grandson, and mentioned that he was 61 years old.¹⁴³ He was born, then, at the end of 1429 or in 1430. On 4th January 1493, again writing to Francesco, he proclaimed that he had served the Gonzaga for 42 years,¹⁴⁴ and on 22nd February 1477, writing to Lodovico, he complained, "Dal '50 per fino al '66 e chiaro a V.S. che io non avii alcuna provigione".¹⁴⁵ At the age of about 20, Fancelli was at work at Revere. It was through the good offices of Cosimo de' Medici that he had gone to Mantua.¹⁴⁶

Luca followed his father as a stone-cutter. Another letter of 24th June 1451 makes clear that Luca was working on the installation of windows (Doc. 93). These windows were to be dooked into the walls with iron. They were almost certainly of stone. They were connected with "lastre che vano dentro". (Doc. 94). Named 'stone-cutter' during the first years of his permanence in the Mantovano, he continued to occupy himself with the carving and installation of windows until 1458 (Docs. 117, 135, 161, 174). Documents of the period during which most of the work was done on the palace at Revere refer to Fancelli in connection with decorative features. Nowhere is there evidence that he worked as an architect

on the palace. The attribution of architectural design work at Revere to Fancelli is maintained on the basis of certain stylistic parallels with a number of country residences in the Mantovano that are without documented authorship.¹⁴⁷ 'La Ghirardina' at Motteggiana and a house at S. Martino de Gusnago are indeed similar in some of their details to the palace at Revere.¹⁴⁸ But they are probably of a slightly later date. Luca's youth at the time of his arrival in the Mantovano must, in view of the elaborate and ingenious nature of the solution of the courtyard, give rise to doubt as to the correctness of the traditional attribution of the palace. Certainly, it is true that in the 15th century there are cases of extremely precocious artists and craftsmen. Then, it is true that Fancelli's architectural expertise was valued in 1487 and 1490 when he acted as a consultant on the project for the cupola of Milan Cathedral.¹⁴⁹ But his celebrity in later life does not permit any inference regarding his skill as a young man, and precocity is not so common that it may be presumed.

Filarete's account in the Trattati of Lodovico's conversion to the 'ancient' manner also gives rise to doubts. He singled out the palace at Revere as an example of the ancient style used for private houses, and referred to it in connection with the Palazzo Rucellai.¹⁵⁰ (Unfortunately, the attractive inference that could be taken from the passage - that both buildings shared one designer - cannot find confirmation elsewhere). Filarete traced the development of the ancient style through two generations. Brunelleschi was the inventor of the style. It was used for

ecclesiastical buildings. Come the second generation, it was used for secular buildings, and private persons adopted it.

Filarete gave Lodovico a speech recounting his conversion: "I too", Lodovico tells Francesco Sforza, "was once pleased by modern building, but as soon as I began to enjoy the antique ones, I grew to despise the modern". He goes on to recall that, when he heard that they were building in the ancient manner in Florence, he "... determined to have one of the men ... heard named".¹⁵¹ If the courtier to whom he goes on to refer is, as Spencer suggests, Alberti, he was surely not one of those heard named, for the passage seems to suggest that they were not the same person. Filarete's mention of a palace on the Po, that may be identified with Revere, is of a building 'done' in the ancient manner. It could be objected that Filarete's conception of ancient architecture was only decorative and that Lodovico's employment of a stone-carver working in the ancient style was sufficient, as far as Filarete was concerned, for him to be said to be building in that manner. But that objection takes no account of the palace itself, where both decorative and architectural reconstruction took place. The palace at Revere cannot have been built before the arrival of one of those heard named if Filarete wrote truly. Alberti was in the Mantovano in 1459¹⁵² and, according to Susan Lang, passing on information provided by Badt,¹⁵³ was also there in 1455. Quintavalle, on the basis of a favourable judgement of the quality of the palace at Revere, plumped, in fact, for an attribution to Alberti.¹⁵⁴ But Fancelli, carving details in the all'antica manner, was at work from 1451. Before employing him, Lodovico must have had some

idea of what the style was.

6. Antonio Manetti and the Palace at Revere.

Before 1451, Lodovico had dealings with a Florentine woodworker, architect and designer who, although neglected after the 15th century, was accounted sufficiently skilled during his lifetime to be employed on many of Florence's most important building projects, including S. Lorenzo,¹⁵⁵ S. Spirito,¹⁵⁶ and SS. Annunziata.¹⁵⁷ From 1452 until 1460, between the appointments of Michelozzo and Bernardo Rossellino, Antonio Manetti was capomaestro of the Duomo.¹⁵⁸ Elected in charge of the lantern on 25th August 1452, he was described as "doctus et expertus".¹⁵⁹

Antonio was first mentioned in connection with the Gonzaga on 18th September 1448, when "Manno Donati fiorentino",¹⁶⁰ who had announced his imminent arrival in the Mantovano, was instructed, because of the plague, to submit to quarantine at Poggio, outside Revere. The letter concludes, "De Antonio Manetti, quando sereti qui ne parleremo cum vui che ad ognimodo el volemo et scriveremogli quanto baxognera" (Doc.56). Of course, Antonio being a woodworker, Lodovico may have been interested in woodwork at this time, but later he did use Manetti's skills on engineering projects. On 20th October, 1451, he asked Gisulfo de Gisulfis, who was in charge of work at Ponte Molino, to tell him "... se adoperati quello inzegno de Antonio Manetto ad impire de giara quelli logi e come el ne serve." (Doc.104). Manetti was in Milan with Lodovico before 21st March, 1451.¹⁶¹ Barbara of Brandenburg wrote to the marquis that transport had been arranged for the courtier, Giovanni da Milano, and Antonio Manetti

(Doc. 81). On 10th December, 1451, in a letter to the Counts of Mirandola, Antonio was referred to as "nostro ingegnere".¹⁶²

(Doc. 107). It is perhaps worth mentioning that Manetti was employed on work on the church of SS. Annunziata in Florence shortly before the first mention of him in Gonzaga correspondence. He had provided a model of the church.¹⁶³ Gian Francesco Gonzaga had left, in his will, 200 ducats "quod expendantur in fabrica illius ecclesiae seu in aliis quae sint et redundant ad decorem ipsius ecclesiae",¹⁶⁴ and Lodovico eventually took over the main burden of patronage of the building from the Medici.¹⁶⁵ Manetti may have been involved with the design work for the hospital of S. Leonardo in Mantua.¹⁶⁶

A letter of 14th October, 1450, to Albertino de Pavesi was written at Revere and mentions Antonio Manetti. It begins on the subject of tie rods for the vault at Revere and concludes with a call to send the painter (who, evidently, was not to be confused with any other) with his assistants, "accio che questa terra(?) non sia tutto questo anno in questa forma". In the middle, "dato che sia l'ordine de questo" (the work on the tie rods), Albertino is instructed, "...di ad Antonio Manetti che se transferisca domani qui ad nui" (Doc. 76).

The clear sequence of instructions implies a link between Manetti and the vault. Perhaps Manetti had an interest in it or it was in connection with the vault that his presence at Revere was sought. The activity of Manetti as designer at Revere is not proved by the letter of 14th October, 1450, but neither is Fancelli's proved by the many documentary references to him. It

would seem reasonable that Lodovico who, in his letter to Mirandola, wrote that Manetti, his engineer or architect, had done and was doing several works for him, would have used the services of a man of greater maturity¹⁶⁷ and an architect of greater celebrity than Fancelli to make designs for the most important palace-building project of the 1450s.¹⁶⁸ The letter to the counts of Mirandola also shows that the length of time that a craftsman spent on site is not in proportion to the degree of likelihood that he designed it; they were told that, should it be necessary, Manetti could go to Mirandola. Evidently, the work that the counts wanted done might be designed at a drawing board.

Unfortunately, an argument suggesting that Manetti laid out the courtyard of the palace at Revere cannot be confronted with the concrete evidence of other examples of his work. Manetti's work in Florence cannot be identified with any degree of confidence, because when he followed others' designs and when he executed his own cannot be specified.¹⁶⁹ Comparable works would, in any case, be difficult to find since the courtyard at Revere adapts to special circumstances and is built with stylistically disparate elements. So, it is not possible to develop a system of paralleled conjectured attributions of parts of buildings. The design of the decorative details at Revere, like the corbel capitals, need not be attributed to Manetti - and it is as well that they were not. Jobbing craftsmen could produce capitals of similar character when left to improvise groups of capitals differing among themselves.¹⁷⁰

If Antonio Manetti did design the courtyard of the palace at Revere, he could have done so after 1448 but, if it is accepted

that proposals of the late 40s anticipated a different layout, a more suitable date would be shortly before or after the delivery of the new, nearly-finished columns (that is, before 18th May, 1450 (Doc. 66)).

The letter of 14th October, 1450 - the first to mention, specifically, "la volta nostra" - contains instructions implying a change in the span of the vault or the time-table for its construction. Two tie rods, already made, were to be joined together and, it appears, an order for four - made by neither the sender nor the recipient of the letter - was to be cancelled or delayed. Evidently, work was to progress at a slower pace, for only one would be delivered to Revere on Lodovico's instructions. The passage in the letter can be interpreted in many ways. The simplest explanation is that the making of new rods was uneconomical when two, already made, could be joined to make one of the four. The instruction may be interpreted in the light of conclusions reached above about the change from one courtyard arrangement to another. Two rods, running in a north-south direction where buttressing from the south was absent, would be required for the north side of the courtyard, built according to the first plan, and would have joined the two spandrels of the three arches to the back wall. The present arrangement of five arches would need four tie rods of greater length to pass from the spandrels to the back wall of the north loggia. The third party who ordered the making of four tie rods required for this arrangement would have been Manetti.

A letter of 14th July, 1450, about rods or 'irons' required for the columns (Doc. 70), should elucidate the meaning

of that of 14th October 1450. But it is too difficult to interpret. Barbara of Brandenburg was instructed to tell the joiner, Gianantonio, "che fatia subito fare li ferri che bisognano qui ale colone de pretaviva..." These rods were to be five braccia long from one small ring or eye to the other "dove dicti ferri vano dentro". Each rod would be about $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet long. (It is difficult to imagine how they could be associated with the column-raising apparatus that Gianantonio was instructed to send on 18th May, 1450 (Doc.66)).

Let it be sufficient to remark that the north portico of the courtyard was being worked on in 1450. If, in October, work was still continuing on the previous courtyard arrangement, a vaulted part was proposed. But, as has been seen, it is likely that the side bays would have been intended to be trabeated. More likely, a change of plan had been made shortly before this time. There is a good chance that Antonio Manetti was involved with the work and that new proposals were presented when very little had been done towards establishing the previous courtyard layout. From the insistence that the courtyard design was not Manetti's it follows that he took no interest in the part of the project where work concentrated, about nine months before the first mention, in documents, of Luca Fancelli.

The following could have been the order of events. Lodovico intended to build a hospital¹⁷¹ and did just what Francesco Sforza did later: aware of the existence of Tuscan examples - particularly Santa Maria Nuova and Siena - and of proposals to build a hospital at Pavia,¹⁷² but unmindful of stylistic developments

in Florence, he sent to have the services of a Florentine engineer. (The matter of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo will be discussed below). Antonio Manetti, with whom he had already been in contact, arrived in the Mantovano in 1450 and gave advice and instructions regarding the project. Meanwhile, work continued at Revere where it was proposed to build a conventional northern Italian palace. Manetti's attention was directed to this other large project. He produced a design for the whole or part of the building and persuaded Lodovico to alter the courtyard that had only just been begun. (Lodovico did not originally intend it to have its present form, and it is unlikely that he, alone, would have decided that the earlier plan was unsuitable). After May 1450, Lodovico decided to accept Manetti's functional arguments and perhaps his suggestions regarding spacial and formal organisation. Manetti may also have recommended the Florentine style of decoration to Lodovico. His activity marked the start of a reconstruction of the palace that tended to become ever more thoroughgoing. However, probably not until Fancelli had been at work for some time did Lodovico's attitude to the specifically decorative aspect of architecture become thoroughly modified.

7. Other Works on the Palace at the Beginning of the 1450s.

Work did not concentrate exclusively upon one part of the palace at Revere. As the concluding part of the letter of 14th October 1450 shows, painting was also to be done. The exterior of the building round about the crenellations was painted with heraldic devices.¹⁷³ Under the roof of the north wing, on the confronting faces of the towers, areas of painted intonaco are still to be seen (Fig. 65). The muzzled dog - a Gonzaga device usually associated with Gian Francesco - may be identified. It is also to be found on the jambs of the front door (Fig. 66) and in Pisanello's sketchbook (Fig. 67). Other images on the towers are more difficult to identify. Below the painted crenellations are swags and simulated brickwork. The painting must date to later mid-century. Perhaps it was done as temporary decoration before the erection of the pitched roof that obscures it.¹⁷⁴ Such work might have been done in anticipation of the visit of a distinguished guest.

About 1450, however, the building was not finished up to its present height. It is clear from study of the brickwork of the north facade that wall-building went ahead keeping roughly in pace with the production of carved window frames. That is, the windows were not usually inserted into holes left or made in the wall.¹⁷⁵ Figure 69 shows schematically how a particularly decipherable stretch of wall rose. Between the windows, wall was built, probably from right to left. The left jamb of the right window was placed first and the lower stone of the right jamb of the left window was ready to be put in place. The upper stone

however, was not yet finished and the wall was raised up to the level of the lintels of the windows, leaving free about six inches from the line of the jamb so that the finished stone could be inserted conveniently (Fig. 70). At other points, at the top window of the west tower for example, the wall was built right up to the level of the lintels before the stone window frames were inserted.

Work on the interior of the palace was also carried out, and the painter was probably obliged to decorate there. Simple decorative paintwork survives under the intonaco in various parts of the building. Wood-work, too, was painted. On 20th May, 1450, "tri fassi di cantinalli depincti in la forma che sono le altre mandate qui" were requested along with nails or dowels. (Doc. 67). Surely, ceilings were being hung. The palace, on which work had been done before 1450, was probably still habitable while work on other parts continued. Another letter of 20th May, 1450, refers to stonework in the interior of the palace (Doc. 68). The 'camera della volta', mentioned in that letter, was presumably situated over a vault or adjacent to one. No rooms in the north wing of the palace are vaulted nowadays as far as can be discovered. The walls of the building are rather thin to withstand the thrust of a vault, but the letter of 7th October (1376) (Doc. 33) suggests that it would have been possible to construct one. The vault of the north portico had not been built in May 1450. But the barrel-vaulted entrance tunnel probably existed and the 'camera della volta' may have been found near it. ¹⁷⁶

Though some parts were fitfully carried forward, letters

requesting the delivery of materials at this time are sufficiently numerous to suggest that work was progressing apace. "Vogliamo che quanto piu presto possibile" prefaced the request for lathes and dowels or nails. The need for urgency is also apparent in a letter of 18th August, 1450: "Vogliamo che tu mandi qua sei soglij e dece segie per questi nostri lavoreri et provedi che subito siano conducti" (Doc. 73).¹⁷⁷ Wood was also required, for a variety of purposes. The Vicar of Quistello was asked to supply wood for the furnaces at Revere,¹⁷⁸ so bricks were being fired and building work was probably in progress.¹⁷⁹ One of the brick-layers at work at Revere at this time is named in a letter. He was Jacomo 'murador'.¹⁸⁰ Lodovico mentioned Ferrarese bricklayers on 21st November, 1450, in a letter to the Vicar of Revere (Doc. 78). Another group of bricklayers, probably from Ferrara, for the recipient of the letter lived in the Ferrarese, was expected at Revere in May, 1451 (Doc. 85), but they were needed for work at Ponte Molino¹⁸¹ (Docs. 89, 91). In fact, about this time, while other works were being done, bricklaying was held up at Revere. On 6th June, 1451, Lodovico wrote, "...se voremo far lavorare al pallazo vedremo per quella ne bisognara de compare tanta calcina o de fornirce per altra via" (Doc. 91). It was important that materials should be available for the work at Ponte Molino. Other requests for wood may have had nothing to do with work on the palace itself but with associated buildings. The vicar of Revere was informed on 29th May, 1450 "...havemo ordinato se mandazzo de le asse sutile ..." (Doc. 69). Wood requested on 25th August, 1450, of the vicars of Quistello, S. Benedetto and

Governolo was needed for scaffolding. They were instructed to acquire "quaranta grade de far ponti longe br. 6 et large br. uno e mezo cum li madoni da ogni lado et quelle face condure qui a Revere da essi consignare a Zohanne da Caravazo..." (Doc. 75). These planks may have been intended to make scaffolding with 50 oak logs, seven braccia long, ordered on 18th August, 1450 (Doc. 74). Wood, certainly for the palace, was the subject of a letter of 21st February, 1451, to the Rectors of Verona - but its non-delivery rather than its delivery to the site was the reason for the letter being written (Doc. 79). Somewhere, at Revere, floors were about to be constructed when, on 8th May, 1451, Albertino de Pavesi was informed in a letter from Revere,

"El vene li Zohanne Antonio Marangone al qual vogliamo tu faci havere 34 asse da solaro de la nostra ... xiiii. travi de piella pur di nostri che sono li sotto el porticho de la corte. Vedi etiam de ritrovare x altre asse sutile vel circha et quelli cantinelle et chiode ch'l te richiedera per far qui due solari et altri lavoreri..." (Doc. 87).¹⁸²

By this time, a good number of floors and ceilings were in place and haste was no less insistently demanded. Albertino was ordered to supply Gianantonio with the materials "quanto piu presto possibile".

8. The Stylistic Character of Works on the Palace at the Beginning of the 1450s.

The picture at this time is of rather hectic activity and of the building growing in a rather chaotic manner. Evidently, parts of the building were carried towards completion with woodwork and painting, while structural work advanced elsewhere with the building of walls and the placing of columns. The plan of procedure was not straightforward as it must be in, say, ship-building, where craftsmen of differing specialities do their different jobs in a set order - where the finishing tradesmen come onto the job last. A programme of building and finishing may have existed at Revere, but it was more complicated and accommodating. The stylistic inconsistencies in the building as well as the architectural and typological mix it represents suggest the loose nature of the programme and possibly the continuously changeable nature of the building's anticipated aspect at any time during its construction.

On 11th August 1451, a letter written at Revere to Albertino contained the request that 'maestro Antonio Tayapetra' be sent "per formar una de queste camerete del torazo nostro qui ..." (Doc.100). It was probably the same Antonio who was mentioned in another letter written at Revere on 17th April 1450, again to Albertino: "vogliamo subito sia ritornato de la montagna Maestro Antonio tayapreta tu ne advisi" (Doc.63). Earlier, on 5th April 1451, Albertino had been ordered to give Antonio ten ducats so that he would have funds when he went off to collect a quantity of stone (Doc.83). Antonio had, perhaps, already delivered the stone and had gone off from Revere when the letter of 11th August

was written, for, on 23rd July 1451, Albertino was instructed to send Antonio to Revere "...cum tuta la preda che'l ha apparichiata per questa camereta..." (Doc. 95). Almost certainly the same Antonio was mentioned in a letter of 21st February 1457: "Perche'l se trova qui maestro Antonio tagliapetra da Verona..." (Doc. 156). If Antonio had not arrived recently from Verona, this Veronese sculptor seems to have worked in one of the towers of the palace.¹⁸³ The only room that, today, has the decoration of Lodovico's time is in the west tower. It has a fireplace of pale Verona marble that was, without doubt, carved by a sculptor of north Italy (Fig. 44). Flanking the Gonzaga arms on the lintel are the letters L. G. It is possible that Antonio carved the fireplace. At any rate, it is likely that he was a north Italian craftsman working in his inherited style in the 'torazo', while Luca Fancelli was working on the windows of the palace. At this time, it appears that different craftsmen, involved with different parts of the building, worked independently of one another. The impression gained is that Antonio, at least, whose work took him to the quarry, occupied him in his shop and involved the installation of finished stonework, was responsible as designer as well as executor of his pieces. In the case of Gianantonio, the joiner, work on one ceiling is very much like work on another. While traditional methods of making ceilings were to be followed, he could be left to himself.

The fact that Antonio and Luca were at work on the building at the same time is worth considering in the light of Filarete's view of events. Filarete regarded Revere as a classicizing building, and he implied that Lodovico was converted

to the style rather suddenly. There may even be the implication that Revere was the first building after Lodovico's conversion. However, the aspect and history of construction of the building as a whole and the contributions of Tuscan and local craftsmen like Luca and Antonio indicate perhaps that Lodovico began the work in accordance with his father's style and introduced its classicizing aspect later (and, at first, rather irresolutely, for the traditional local style was not totally supplanted).

Whilst individual craftsmen worked on their parts of the job and there was no overall stylistic 'policy', a general programme of building and finishing was, presumably, followed. Who controlled the workmen in that limited sense that their work was part of an order of events? There appear to have been two co-ordinators. One was Lodovico himself. It may be observed that work on the palace was often progressing quickest while he was at Revere. Many of the letters were written at Revere and are to be found in the secretaries' notebooks.¹⁸⁴ Many of the problems that came up as the building was being constructed, then, were probably discussed on site by Lodovico and his craftsmen. In Lodovico's absence, the vicar was in charge. From 19th May, 1451, when he was given the right to hire and fire (Doc. 90)¹⁸⁵ till 4th January 1460, when control of the work was handed over to the Podestà of Ostiglia (Doc. 222), he administered the site. Earlier too, it was his business, and correspondence between the vicars and Lodovico on the subject of the palace, though not complete, is quite copious. He saw to it that Lodovico's instructions were enacted, as in 1451 when he feared that for want of materials he would be unable to have some floors laid (Doc. 106). He

received specific instruction not to interfere with craftsmen's work when Lodovico wrote, on 24th June, 1451, that Luca should be left to install the windows as he thought best (Doc. 93).¹⁸⁶

Fancelli was at work on the palace while Antonio was preparing the stonework for the room in the tower. It was his intervention that did most to alter the character of the palace from that which it would have had if all the decorative work had been in the hands of northern craftsmen. It is he who is documented as having worked on the windows, the main front doorway and the various chimney pieces that gave to the palace that aspect that Filarete and others admired.

Summary

The lower flanks of the towers of the palace are structurally continuous with the north facade and with the brickwork above. However, their fenestration is different from that of the facade and the higher flanks of the towers. In the courtyard, the columns and capitals are stylistically discontinuous, with arches, vaulting systems and corbel capitals. Moreover, there are certain structural anomalies. These points indicate a change in Lodovico's proposals for the building at the very beginning of the 1450s. It seems that Lodovico did two things. As well as creating the present courtyard as a thing in itself, he altered the interior spaces towards the courtyard where corridors to the rooms of the side wings and large habitable spaces above the north portico were provided. It has been suggested that the architect responsible for this change should more readily be identified as Antonio Manetti than Luca Fancelli. At this stage, Luca seems to have been responsible for stonework. He produced the second change for Lodovico when he provided the all'antica details for the building.

The description of such a change in Lodovico's artistic and functional purposes in the palace tends to imply that the palace documents a strict chronological development in terms of the history of style. However, although stylistic discontinuities exist in the palace now, they do not point to a consistent and regular stylistic development. In the courtyard, the columns and their capitals are prior to the corbels, arches and vaulting systems in execution and conception, and the 'values' represented in the latter supplanted those in the former to the point where stylistic inconsistencies were

preferable to the first solution for which it has been argued that the columns were ordered.¹⁸⁷ However, elsewhere in the palace, the two sets of values - the two styles - could co-exist for some time longer. Decorative work in the local tradition continued to be produced, it seems, after the 'Tuscanizing' designs for the building were adopted.

While there seem to have been plans for parts of the building, there does not seem to have been a single overall programme of building and finishing. The contemporary presence on the site of northern craftsmen and Tuscan workers, the evidence of both of whose activity is visible, indicates the loose nature of the programme. Work seems to have been done within the strictures imposed by the established lines of wall and divisions of elevation.

Nevertheless, a partiality was shown to the 'Tuscanizing' component. Implied in that preference is an attitude in the patron that is determinedly novel in the north Italian ambience. As the all'antica style did not replace the traditional local one completely it is justified to consider it as ornamental rather than substantial, when it was applied to the north facade.

IV. The 'All'Antica' Ornament of the Palace

1. The Installation of Windows and Door in the North Facade.

The first framed windows to be installed in the north facade of the palace were those plain rectangular ones with a simple cyma moulding contained within a narrow flat band running round all four sides (Fig. 16). Their sharply bevelled inner faces make the lights deeply recessed. Similarly austere frames are to be found on the attic level of the courtyard of the Foundling Hospital in Florence. These low-level windows at Revere may have been the ones referred to in a letter of 5th March 1451.

Barbara of Brandenburg wrote to Lodovico,

"De le finestre per le palazzo da Reveri non ho sentito altro doppo che mandai al vicario li le lettere che sopra cio scrisea La S. ali Rectori di Vineza e al podesta de Este, come ne habia alchuna cosa la S. Vostra ne sera avisata e non possendosse haver le prede se vedera salten(?) de havere el dessigno e manderasse come la S. Vostra scrive." (Doc. 80)

The problem seems to have been solved by 24th June 1451, when Luca was on the point of putting windows in place (Doc. 93). It appears that the design might have existed independently of the presence at Revere of someone to install them.¹⁸⁸ It is not necessary, then, to insist that they were designed by Luca. The letter of 24th June suggests that he had worked the stone. Later, the preparation of window frames was interrupted because stone was unavailable. On 14th April 1452, an explanation of why

cloth-of-gold could not be supplied to Gabriele da Gorigia was amplified with a lament that the Venetian authorities refused to allow transportation from Ferrara of "alcune prete da far finestre per lo palazzo nostro da Revere" (Doc. 113). By 2nd June, 1452, stone had arrived at Revere and Barbara of Brandenburg assured the vicar of Revere that she would inform Lodovico of that fact (Doc. 114). Perhaps another load had been delivered by 28th September. Luca had been sent to Ferrara to collect it (Doc. 117). Again in connection with windows, Luca was mentioned on 26th July, 1455. He delivered money to the factors of Ostiglia for the transportation of stone from Verona (Doc. 135).

Two kinds of stone were used for the windows. Those of the north facade and the flank of the west tower are of a whitish stone of a limestone-like quality. The windows of the courtyard are of soft yellow sandstone. Twelve windows were carved for the courtyard. Thirteen of the same design were made for the facade and nine were placed on the flank of the west tower.¹⁸⁹ The white stone is like Verona limestone. Rodolico mentions a yellowish sandstone found at Udine.¹⁹⁰

Work was being carried out on the north facade in 1455. On 25th October, Lodovico, at Goito, wrote to the vicar. "Vogliamo che ne debbi subito advisare in che termine se ritrova la fazada denanci de la casa nostra li et quanto seti in zoso cum li ponti..." (Doc. 142). The facade, as it is now, gives no evidence of scaffolding having been used. There are no holes in the brickwork, but they were being filled in on 26th October 1455 (Doc. 143). That in-filling would have been on the lower levels, for a photograph

taken in the 1930s shows that holes were still to be seen on the upper levels (Fig. 71).

Clearly, in 1455, Lodovico expected that there should be something to show for work done. A month earlier, he had been at Revere and had written, as was usual when metal or metalwork was required, to his treasurer and the controller of the mint, Albertino de Pavesi ¹⁹¹ (Doc. 139). Perhaps they were metal frames or grilles that he requested. These 'feriate da finestra' were to be nine in number. Six were to measure 2 by 3 braccia and three, 3 by 4 braccia. They would be about 3' (0.914m.) by 4'6" (1.371m.) or by 6' (1.829m.). The smaller may have been required for the lowest row of windows of the north facade, but windows of the same size are to be found elsewhere in the building. The windows of the piano nobile are about 4'6" broad but are taller than six feet. It is not possible to make a definite statement regarding the intended whereabouts of the 'feriate'.

On 3rd August, 1457, the vicar of Revere had had work begun on the installation of a window. Luca Fancelli, meanwhile, was at work at Revere on a chimney piece. He was to transport it to Mantua and install it (Doc. 161). Work on the making of window frames remained to be done on 10th January, 1458, when Luca wrote to Lodovico that he would pay off four masters - presumably, like him, stone-carvers ¹⁹² - and, with two, would make six 'finestrele' (Doc. 174). It appears that Luca wanted to avoid being over-worked. The use of the diminutive suggests that the windows, if they were for the palace, were to be placed in the facade or on the side of the west tower because the courtyard

windows are all of the larger size, needed to light the piano nobile. However, the implication of the suggestion is that the east tower, where the windows are of terracotta, was not finished at the time. It is possible that the windows were intended to be set into the east tower and were never made, or that they were not for the palace. In fact, the second possibility seems more probable. It seems unlikely that the 'finestrele' were for Revere. Luca's reply was to a letter in which Lodovico instructed him not to prepare stone-work, except for a chimney piece for the "castello nostro qui" (at Mantua) (Doc. 173). Luca wrote back on the subject probably only of that castle's stone-work.

Luca, at the time, had just finished putting the front door of the palace at Revere in place (Fig. 79). Lodovico wrote to the vicar on 4th December 1457, "... ce piace molto che quella porta se metta inopera cum li capitelli..." (Doc. 167). The following day, replying to a complaint from Luca that an investment of land that he awaited was taking a long time to be made, Lodovico advised circumspection in such matters and suggested that the matter might be settled once the door was in place (Doc. 168). Though the front door is not the only one with capitals - another now gives access to the west stairwell¹⁹³ - there can be little doubt that it was to the front door that reference was made in the documents. Lodovico visited Revere in March 1458, and Marsilio Andreasi, his secretary, remarked in a letter of 14th to Barbara that Lodovico inspected the door (Doc. 180). It had a "coperta de prede cocte" that Lodovico wanted replaced by one of stone. The door's plasticity, implied by the existence of the cover, tends to verify that this

was the front door. It is the facade's richest embellishment, and Lodovico liked it. At this same time, he showed it and the fireplace to 'maestro Zohanne' (da Padova?): "...la qual (porta) certo piace ala S. Sua". He also showed it - with pride and satisfaction, it may be imagined - to the Bishop of Verona. After they had visited the site of the new monastery of S. Ludovico Re di Francia, Andreasi wrote, "... sono ritornati e stati a contemplare questa faciata e la porta ..." (Doc.200). If not completely finished, the facade was finished far enough to be a satisfactory object of contemplation.

2. Windows and Front Door as Classicizing Elements.

The same details of the building that Andreasi wrote about were probably also those which elicited Filarete's expressions of approval. For him, along with the Palazzo Rucellai in Florence, the palace at Revere exemplified the ancient style used by private patrons.¹⁹⁴ In common with the Palazzo Rucellai, the palace at Revere has a facade with fairly elaborately-carved details in a classicizing style. But to the contemporary visitor it is not a building strongly reminiscent of the "age of antiquity". The details seem to be applied like collage to a skin of wall that has only a colour value. No sense of an architectural unity of intention communicates to him. On large areas of blank wall hang windows, like pictures. They are hung in vertical and horizontal rows, but these rows do not mark out a regular grid whose interspaces are readily comprehended. The visual effect of placing the middle three vertical rows relatively close together and the rows down the towers towards their outer edges is, in fact, rather Venetian (though the middle three windows do not light a single space) (Fig. 36). The windows merely decorate, and their classicizing style is decorative. But decoration seems to have been sufficient for Filarete to identify in the building the 'ancient' style. As Salmi remarked, some of the designs he offered in his treatise in fact resemble the palace at Revere in general outline¹⁹⁵ - notably the house for a gentleman (Fig. 73). A spatial or structural characteristic was not the 'sine qua non' of the revival he sought, and found, at Revere.¹⁹⁶

Square-headed windows were considered to be all'antica

by the builders of the Foundling Hospital in Florence.¹⁹⁷ At Revere, a potentially versatile form was used (Fig. 74). Its many appearances in terracotta in Mantua show that it was well-suited to incorporation in brick buildings. Being composed of a flat frame, contained by a narrow, shallow moulding running round the sides and top of the light, surmounted by a heavy moulded lintel and standing on a sill of related form, such a window could lend itself to elaboration, as at Ragusa where it is decorated with shells and other motifs¹⁹⁸ or in and around Urbino where a frieze was introduced between the moulded and flatter lintels - the latter being given the character of an architrave. The basic frame could also be topped by a pediment as on the facade of the Foundling Hospital in Florence (Fig. 75). The window type used at Revere resembles that used on the flank of the Palazzo Capranica in Rome. But the example that it most closely resembles appears behind the episode of Joseph revealing his identity to his brothers in the panel of Ghiberti's second bronze doors (Fig. 76). Indeed, it is practically identical. Michelozzo is thought to have been involved with the chasing of later panels of the doors.¹⁹⁹ However, the window on the door and the one at Revere may have a common prototype because both may be considered elaborations of the simple type used at the Foundling Hospital.

Without added elements it is a rather unsubstantial form, insufficiently developed plastically, so to seem rather timorous - especially when placed in broad stretches of flat wall. However, the window type used at Revere does acquire a confident

air in the courtyard where the wall areas are smaller. And the insubstantiality of the north wall does mean that it lacks the visual strength to support windows of much greater weight.

The pedimented front door is more obviously and specifically classicizing. It also resembles another carved not many years before. The front door imitates the lines of a smaller and plainer door built by Michelozzo in 1448 at the entrance to the sacristy corridor of S. Croce in Florence (Fig. 77). Vasari wrote of Michelozzo's door that "fu in que' tempi molto lodata per la novità sua e per il frontespizio molto ben fatto, non essendo allora se non pochissimo in uso l'imitare, come quella fa, le cose antiche di buona maniera."²⁰⁰ Vasari seems to have thought that it had a model, or models. Both the door at S. Croce and that at Revere consist of triangular pediment supported by two Corinthian pilasters, containing a square-headed door frame. Michelozzo's door opening is proportionally taller compared with the door at Revere where the heavy entablature and the higher pediment are better related in mass to the strength of the pilasters. That is, in S. Croce, the pilasters possess by comparison a superfluous strength. At Revere, there is a stronger sense of energy - the energy that the pilasters put into their work of holding up the weighty lintel. The more the force going to ground, implied by the mass of a member, and the vertical forces - not just the mass - resisting that pressure are equalized the more economic is the arrangement and the more exhilaratingly courageous does it appear to the viewer.

The execution of the Revere door is careful, but in parts,

especially where low relief is used, as in the palmettes circumscribing the pediment, rather cold and mechanical (Figs. 79, 80). The door is worked in both high and low relief and is, in all, robustly plastic. The flutes and dentil courses, for example, recall in the carefulness of their carving, the indoor work of Bernardo Rossellino, like that on the Bruni monument. Outdoor work by Rossellino, like that at Pienza (Fig. 81), is recalled by the deeply-incised and, therefore, tonally more contrasting egg-and-dart. The distinction of the door derives from its design rather than from its execution which, overall, is careful and precise. Mouldings have been imaginatively juxtaposed - the quantities of relief nicely judged. For example, from the half-lit and tonally modulated cyma inversa moulding at the base of the pediment downwards to two sharp, black edges framing a narrow, flat strip below which are the short, shallowly-carved flutes, the eye passes quite abruptly, over a narrow, flat band to the recessed level of the egg-and-dart moulding where tones are gradated and circumscribed by the hard black shadows produced by the deep cutting of the stone. The transition from this last strong-contrast band to the tonally quieter strigiated frieze (implicitly non-load-bearing) is made by the course of elongated dentils which repeats the two-tone passage above. The strigiations which are now much-damaged would have had a gently-modelled plasticity - a reduced tone range as in the flutes and over the curved profile of the egg-and-dart course. Not until the level of the capitals is stone again excavated as it is on the level of the egg-and-dart, and is abrupt tone change permitted. The

capitals are drilled at the ends of the leaves and 'grow' out of the stone, not obeying, in an obvious way, the pure geometric discipline of the stones of which they are carved. Just at the point where the conflict of forces is most violent does the stone break out courageously, with *élan* - or perhaps just 'foolhardiness' - into foliate forms. The architrave between frieze and capitals is relatively flat, rigid and heavy.

The execution of the door seems to have followed a very carefully prepared design. More freedom was permitted the carver of the jambs and lintel, where the same mechanical austerity is not found. In place of the geometric carving of details and the academic quality of the working of the capitals are freely treated ribbons, wavy leafed laurel, discs strung together, strips of wickerwork pattern and other motifs. A kind of naturalistic illusionism is found in the treatment of the inner doorframe. In its variety and freedom of invention, it may be associated with the corbel capitals of the north portico, where identity of function does not insist upon identity of treatment.²⁰¹ Thus, decoration is truly "added", rather than something "proper and innate" to the basic structural form. The discipline of pilasters, capitals and entablature contrasts with the quality of improvisation found in the corbels and jambs. Also, the plasticity of the whole door, considered as a piece of architecture with the expression of which the 'canonical' decoration conspires, contrasts with the flatness of the pictorial relief of the jamb decoration and shields. Desiderio da Settignano on the Marsuppini monument and, to a lesser extent, Bernardo Rossellino on the Bruni monument, following perhaps

the example of Donatello, allowed their freedom of invention to pass from the decoration of the furniture - the hanging and animal and vegetable details - to the structural - architectural parts of their compositions. They modified Donatello's floridness, for example in the Cavalcanti Annunciation, towards elegance. The carver of the door at Revere did otherwise. Freedom of invention and illusionistic carving was confined to the door frame. It may be the case, then, that the execution of the door was not entirely the work of its designer. It might be expected that the inner jambs and lintel would have been more in character with the pilasters and entablature if all had been designed by the same person.²⁰²

The restraint and clarity of design of the door are also found in the windows. Though less detailed, they are carved with the same control. Luca and his assistants must have been responsible for the carving of both door and windows, just as the documents say. But they were not necessarily responsible for the design. Luca could have adopted the window form for later work. Improvised and varied treatment, found in the corbels and inner door frame, is also found in some of the other work that may be attributed to Fancelli - in the Castel di San Giorgio, for example (Fig. 84).²⁰³ The door frames of the church of S. Sebastiano are similarly rich and varied, and in conception, if not in the timidity of execution, the doorway to the west stairwell, at Revere, is related to the corbels. Chimney pieces that may have been made for the palace also tend to be more fantastic and copious than the front door²⁰⁴ (Fig. 85). Luca continued to use the window type

found at Revere, probably because its low profile and simplicity lent it to brick construction.

The door is a classicizing one, but no single model may be suggested for its details. It is probably not a copy.²⁰⁵ The capitals, for example, while resembling as a type the rather stolid pilaster capital of Michelozzo's Cappella del Crocefisso in the church of S. Miniato al Monte in Florence,²⁰⁶ appear to return to originals, and to be hybrids of two examples with some variations in the proportions of parts. The profile of the abacus resembles that of the capitals of the interior of the Pantheon (Fig. 86). The axial volutes or spirals meet in a similar way, but the volutes at Revere are lower and less-strongly stated as they curve. The shapes of the acanthus leaves are different where they flop over. At Revere, a rather regular scollop shape is created. A more varied and broken edge is made at the Pantheon. The elongated, almond-shaped points are common not only to the Pantheon and some of the capitals of the Baptistry in Florence but also to the work of other 15th century Florentine sculptors like Francesco di Simone. The treatment of the volutes at Revere is similar to that of those in the Baptistry (Fig. 87). Both sets are unusual in being supported by sprays of acanthus. Brunelleschi's capital, which was a popular model, has volutes left unadorned by acanthus decoration.²⁰⁷ Again in common with examples in the Baptistry is the understatement of the tight scrolls in which the volutes terminate. The capitals at Revere do not copy either those of the Pantheon or those of the Baptistry, but may be a combination of these well-known examples. Nor do they copy the

capitals described by Alberti and Vitruvius. The distance between abacus and astragal looks as if it is divided by two or two-and-a-half at Revere. Alberti and Vitruvius recommended a division by three.²⁰⁸ This explains the consequent diminution in the size of the volutes. The lack of expressed energy - forcing the inference of brittleness to the material - at the junction of capital and abacus makes for an almost decadent effeminacy.²⁰⁹ The Revere capitals also look as if they are more than a shaft base high.

Some of the decorative mouldings of the entablature are found on Roman remains - for example, the arches of Septimus Severus and Titus - but never, so far as is known, all together. Small flutes decorate the cornices of the Temple of Antonius and Faustina, and the Temple of Jupiter Stator in Campo Vaccino. But they are not an uncommon motif. As at Revere, the cornice, in the first case, has no mutules. But the architrave consists of only two elements. The entablature at Revere, like the capitals, may be an easy combination of elements from various models. Except for the mutules, lacking at Revere, an entablature that it resembles tops the arch of Trajan at Benevento, drawn by Giuliano da Sangallo round about the end of the 15th century, in the Barberini Sketchbook (Fig. 88).²¹⁰ Interestingly perhaps, comparison of the drawing with a photograph of the arch (Fig. 89) points to a heaviness in the drawing and an accentuation of the sculpted parts. Drawn and painted architectural detail in the 15th century often possesses that heaviness: for example, the drawings accompanying Filarete's treatise and the Barberini Panels. This is probably because the draughtsmen's means were graphic rather

than tonal. At any rate, at Revere, the quality of the design - the proportioning of decorative courses - brings to mind rather drawings such as those of Sangallo than ancient remains themselves. The front door may have been executed according to instructions contained in an annotated drawing, rather than with the benefit of direct recollection of the antique objects upon which it was based. The drawing would have provided no information about the decoration of the inner frame²¹¹ and may have been inexplicit about some of the plastic quantities of the mouldings. The door's origins are somewhere between Michelozzo and Alberti, being, to use Saalman's expression, 'antiquizing-decorative'.²¹²

3. The Introduction of the All'Antica Style to Mantua.

Lodovico was certainly conscious of the ancient style: so he was not uninterested in its use at Revere. And Luca Fancelli was his expert on all'antica detail. For example, he was asked, on 9th December 1457, to provide the design of a cornice "al antiqua cum li cavi tondi e portione sue ..." (Doc. 169). Some documents seem to hint at Lodovico's enthusiasm for the style at this time. It was introduced, apparently, not without a certain amount of difficulty - local craftsmen being either unwilling to accept it or incapable of understanding it.²¹³ Presumably it presented stylistic and technical problems, like for example deeper cutting. Lodovico was aware of the novelty of the work of Fancelli to local craftsmen when he wrote, on 11th December, thanking him for the design of the cornice: "... vedremo se queste nostri la intenderano" (Doc. 170). Perhaps it was the conservatism of local craftsmen that he regretted when he wrote to Giovanni da Padova, on 15th June 1459, asking for two or three joiners "che sapesseno intagliar de ligname" and concluded, "Ma voriano esser zoveni che se lasassano insignar e non vechi che volesseno far a suo modo come voleva quello da Verona" (Doc. 216).²¹⁴ It seems that the work to be done could not be approached with a traditional attitude or method. Also, resistance to the ancient style came not only from craftsmen. The ancient style seemed strange to Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga when he saw S. Sebastiano,²¹⁵ and, in response to criticisms of the plans for the rotunda of SS. Annunziata, Alberti accused the critics of the conservatism of ignorance: "... sara piu bella che chose che vi sia, e... chos storo

nollo intendono, perche e' non sono usi a vedere simile chose...'²¹⁶

By the later 1450s, there seems to have been in Lodovico's mind a determination to have work done in the ancient style, rather than an attitude of mere acceptance of it. It is reasonable to suppose that his enthusiasm was warmed, at least partly, by the example of work done, and that, as Fancelli worked, his approval increased until he became an advocate of the style. Perhaps Lodovico paid a homage to the Florentine style insofar as it was the 'ancient style' in 1462. He had a window installed in the "chamera fiorentina" in the Castello (di S. Giorgio?). Fancelli and his staff would do the job. In the meantime, Florentine woodworkers were in Mantua (Doc. 231).

However, the ancient style, as it was applied to the facade of the palace at Revere, merely consisted in decorative details - not to be distinguished sharply from interior furnishings like fireplaces - and Lodovico's understanding of contemporary Tuscan architecture, that might have been deepened significantly by discussions of the formal problems presented by the space of the courtyard, remained fairly superficial, though not unimpressive in Filarete's opinion.

The difference between the 'ancient' and 'modern' manners was recognisable and the details sufficed to make the palace an all'antica building. For the visitor with an interest in classical or classicizing building, though, it is disappointing. The details themselves are disappointingly uncanonical in appearance for such a visitor. However, the 15th century visitor probably did not set very high standards of archaeological accuracy compared

with Stuart and Revett. The important point is not the accuracy of the reconstruction but its ability to convince, and that is an index of the lack of knowledgeableness of the viewer. Consideration of antiquarians like Cyriaco d'Ancona and Felice Feliciano²¹⁷ does not suggest that their enthusiasm for the antique was tepid or that their visions did not convince themselves. Nonetheless, as Mitchell has observed,²¹⁸ Felice's drawing of the Porta dei Borsari in Verona is inaccurate. There is no reason to doubt that Francesco Filelfo was sincere when he wrote of the palace at Revere, praising its antique appearance.²¹⁹ The appeal of a neo-classical building - and the palace may be considered, for some of its features, such a building - depends very much upon the preparation and sympathies of those who view it.

The classicizing veneer applied to the facade of the palace was sufficient for it to have an air of the antique. But the facade did not imitate antique architecture for its virtues from a purely practical or formal-aesthetic view-point. The antique, being made a contemporary phenomenon, was allusive, and evocative of past time. It offered the imagination the possibility of a kind of escapism from the mundane and actual. In the Sala del Pisanello, the earlier Christian days of chivalry were up-dated in a more literal way, but the conflation of past and present time, creating an elegiac mood, gave rise similarly to the possibility of an imaginative escapism. Lodovico, when applying his energies to the building of the palace at Revere, substituted another period of imaginative adventure.²²⁰ The relation of, in this case, decorative 'imagery' to reality was

equally tenuous. Art was a substitute for reality. Where it was not to practical suitability or the skillfulness of the craftsmanship, the response of the visitor was subjective. Its cause did not exist in the object alone, as would be presumed to be the case with formal qualities, but also in the fabric of his tastes, prejudices and knowledge.

In this respect, Lodovico's taste before 1459, when Alberti and Mantegna arrived in the Mantovano, and after, does not fall into two distinct phases. Heroes may have changed - Caesar for Tristram - but not the conception of the purpose of a work of art in relation to the world and the viewer. A sentimental approach is common to both periods.²²¹ Mantegna's paintings, where their subject-matter was suitable, offered an image of the ancient world.²²² Emblematic of his purpose, in its inappropriateness to the drama, was the inscription on the arch in the scene of St. James before Augustus, in the Eremitani in Padua. His purpose was often that of an illustrator - to create for the imagination a version of the ancient world.²²³ In the Camera degli Sposi, Mantegna made an 'architectural' environment. The painted decorative architectural framework of the Camera is an 'antique' ambience for real people as well as painted people. Historical distance is not created specifically, for both painted figures and real occupants of the room were contemporaries when it was painted. But, contained in the decorative scheme, past and present were conflated and the ancient world was re-created. A similar conflation had been made in the Sala del Pisanello. Ladies in the room dressed just like those depicted. Gentlemen in armour

looked just like the knights of the Round Table. Mantegna's archaeological interests enabled him to develop a very elaborate picture of the ancient world. A sense of distance between past and present exists. In this respect, his work is different from Pisanello's in the Sala, where the time intervening between the events and their depiction receives no visible indication. Past and present exist contemporaneously in the imagination but a sense of history separates them from one another. Mantegna's archaeological interests, producing a mass of visual data, gave him that sense. So, his attempts to give the past, present actuality could not succeed completely, and the melancholy of his work²²⁴ - more poignant than in Pisanello's thematic rather than visual conflation²²⁵ - is in the sense it communicates of the distance of present from past. The appositeness of the imagery for Lodovico is not therefore qualified on that account. But both Mantegna and Pisanello supplied substitutes and served the imaginations - perhaps even yearnings - of those for whom they worked.

In the Camera degli Sposi, the ceiling panels simulating relief sculpture are decorative. They proclaim that they are artifacts. Hercules' virtues are emblematic rather than real. He is a moral fiction for the real space of the room. It would be in a fictitious - a picture - space that he would be accessible to the imagination of the viewer as a protagonist in his own moral life. The classical god's actions have a plausibility in a picture space: they may be integrated into the contemporary imagination, to be specific moral examples. But in the Camera, the emblematic and fictitious nature of the moral posture of the occupants of the

ceiling panels reduces the reality of the real space, and the room becomes like a stage set - fit for masquerading, with the kind and degree of imagination that that requires.

The palace at Revere - with its classicizing details, a less elaborate creation than the decorated space of the Camera degli Sposi - made similar provision for the imaginative life. A more developed imagery appeared after Alberti and Mantegna arrived in the Mantovano.

The classicizing details at Revere may be considered as imagery, for the loose relationship that they have with one another and their failure to be linked through a classical architectural scheme means that an additive principle lay behind their invention and composition. They are 'attached' to the body of the building. It would be unfair to say that the facade is hung with trophies of antiquarian erudition, but is true to say that the details are employed as sculptural and ornamental elements rather than architectonic ones.²²⁶ The situation perhaps parallels Mantegna's treatment of the relics of antiquity in the backgrounds of pictures. He does not produce a topographical view, but a composite picture. Since, in classical architecture, the grounds for approval of the formal merit of a detail apply when the whole is considered, Revere, where details exist without implication for the rest of the building, does not adhere to the rule and cannot be considered to be classical in conception. Of course, approval of the classicizing details alone did not exist independently of favourable judgement of their formal merit, but that was not the most important justification of the design of the elements of the

facade. These elements were all'antica and were evocative of that period. Lodovico's wish to have the services of Mantegna may be taken as support for the claim that that was the state of his appreciation of the antique in 1457. The origins of his sentimentalism may be traced in the courtly world of the Sala del Pisanello, and its survival may be found in the palace at Revere and in the work of Mantegna.

There was a distinction to be made, and Alberti made it, between subjective response to the emotive content of art and response to the objective formal quality of things - the one dwelling upon the affections of the senses, the other upon an object of understanding. Beauty resided in the latter. For example, proportion, or any other formal characteristic, was a creation of understanding instead of a primary cause acting on the senses. Alberti expressed the distinction in the contrast of opinion and judgement. He wrote,

"...sunt quibus..., dicantque solutam et vagam esse quandam opinionem qua de pulchritudine atque omni aedificatione iudicemus, et pro cuiusque libidine variam et mutabilem esse formam aedificationem, nullis artium praeceptis astringendam."²²⁷

Typically of the period of speculative philosophy, Alberti believe in the superiority of judgement over opinion: judgement was above flux. He wrote to that effect to Matteo de' Pasti in connection with Antonio Manetti's belief that domes should be two diameters high: "... se lui si reggie a oppinione, non mi maraviglierò s'egli errerà spesso". Earlier in the letter, he had

written that he put more faith in those who built baths and the Pantheon, than in Manetti, and much more in reason than in people.²²⁸ His aversion to opinion is further developed in a passage in Della Famiglia. More than error, he believed that vice resulted, in part, from the exercise of mere opinion. Vice, he wrote in Book III, is "scoretta consuetudine e corrota ragione, la quale viene de vane opinione e imbecillità di mente".²²⁹

Such an understanding follows the Scholastic view and is the corollary of the idea that virtue attaches to science which deals with what is true, but not opinion, which can be true or false.²³⁰ Aquinas quoted Aristotle to this effect in On the Virtues in General.

Opinion, like sense, considers the individual. Judgement, however, is concerned with the universal. And it is in the realm of the universal that beauty is found. This is clear from Alberti's discussion of beauty, where he talked of girls of differing stature. A girl might be fat or thin, but she would not be accounted ugly because of the one or the other characteristic. The fatness or the thinness belong to the individual. But beauty belongs to the species. The species - the universal - does not exist in things in a physical sense, but metaphysically, and in the intellect that provides the identification.²³¹ Beauty cannot be part of individuals in the way that white is part of Socrates, for, as in mankind viewed in this way, there are many colours, there would be many beauties, and therefore no Beauty. Beauty, for Alberti, excludes the accidental and is the essence of the species. What attaches to the individual, qua individual, is an object of sense, and is a matter of opinion. The intellect judges and identifies

the universal, and the beautiful. Aristotle expressed the matter in the Metaphysics:

"... knowledge cannot be sometimes knowledge and sometimes ignorance, but the state which varies thus is opinion, so too demonstration and definition cannot vary thus, but it is opinion that deals with that which can be otherwise than it is ... clearly there can neither be definition nor demonstration about individuals."²³²

The nature of the beautiful thing - here the work of architecture - is explained in universal terms. The faculty of judgement identifies it. But judgement also makes it in a sense. Alberti's definition of beauty in De Re carries the implication of judgement's importance and alludes to its deep intellectual source - the innata quaedam ratio. Ratio has already been contrasted with opinio (IX, 5) and is therefore to be equated with judgement. Ratio governs the organising of the parts of beautiful things.²³³ In the circumstances in which his rule of beauty would apply, variety has been reduced to unity and the parts are related in such a way that no alteration may be made without the thing becoming improbabilius. A mathematical equation would have the same necessary consistency as that to which the definition refers.

At the very beginning of De Re, in the prologue, Alberti discussed ratio or disegno - and materia, the one the product of thought, the other of nature.²³⁴ He stated his belief that architecture is the adapting of material - the stuff of the world

of contingency - to immaterial disegno - the Euclidean geometry that was for him necessarily true and immanent in the world.²³⁵

Architecture's greatness resided in the fact that it satisfied the purposes of all the sciences, being necessary, useful and for its own sake. Both disegno and materia are required for it to fulfil its purposes. Thus, the architect must be acquainted with pure science, the 'noblest art' - that which is for its own sake.²³⁶

Architecture not only seeks to inform matter with the perfection of geometry. It also aspires to the necessary relations of parts that geometrical demonstration has - geometry having no sure empirical verification. The quality of the transcendent agreement of elements - of a mathematical expression and immanent in created things, whether by man or by nature, both possessing ratio - is concinnitas.²³⁷

But concinnitas has a further facet of meaning. It is the continuous ordering principle while all the elements in the expression are changing towards their end. It is the timeless rule of things in flux and corresponds with Aristotle's Final Cause. It controls the teleological principle in man and nature, so that it "runs through every part and action of man's life, and every production of nature herself".²³⁸ Rather a mode of action than a quality in itself (except insofar as the end of becoming is the 'good' of what becomes, and it is the potency to that good), it is to be distinguished from the material cause - materia - and the formal cause - disegno - both of which constitute the complete object as such and continue to be present in it. (The Final Cause ceases to exist when the thing has come into being). So, Alberti could

write "Nor does congruity arise so much from the body in which it is found, or any of its members, as from itself and from nature, so that its true seat is in the mind and in reason".²³⁹ The end of what is in the process of coming into being is good and beautiful. Thus, concinntitas, the final cause, is the "original of all that is graceful and handsome".²⁴⁰ Its seat being in reason, pulchritudo is apprehended by the "innata quaedam ratio".

Associated with venustas, but distinct from beauty as it has been discussed above, is ornament. It bears the relationship to structure (with which beauty is associated) that accident bears to substance, like colour does to bodies. Alberti's categories here derive from Aristotle and Aquinas. Aquinas, following Aristotle, had said that there are substances and accidents. Alberti, has substance composed of matter and form. Ornament is "somewhat added or fastened on rather than proper and innate".²⁴¹ Alberti quoted Cicero, but he also followed Aquinas when he wrote, in connection with the youth of Athens, to the effect that ornament accompanies a certain lack.²⁴² In The Principles of Nature, Aquinas wrote, "...there are three principles of nature; matter, form and privation".²⁴³ And later he wrote, "Wherefore privation is said to be, not an essential principle, but an accidental one, since it coincides with the matter".²⁴⁴ The coincidence of the accident or the privation with the matter establishes, given the analogy with ornament, that ornament itself is an object of sense, but not of judgement, whose object

is form and the universal.

Beauty is an objective phenomenon apprehended by a faculty that is universal in man, and formal values are the object of Alberti's appreciation in De Re Aedificatoria. 'Beauties' existing in the imaginations of individuals - in their predilections, sympathies and appetites - are of little value because, being idiosyncratic, they do not have universal reality and cannot be investigated or described scientifically. The palace at Revere does not have concinnitas.

Built between the periods of activity of Pisanello and Mantegna, the palace documents not a change of critical values, but a change of object for the imagination. In place of the mediaeval legend was put the world of ancient Roman greatness, here passed through the interpretative sieve of Florence.

Summary

The classicizing features of the north facade of the palace are pieces of stone-carved decoration applied to the wall rather than intrinsic parts of an architectonic scheme. They were executed by Luca Fancelli and his assistants throughout most of the 1450s. To that workshop may also be attributed the corbel capitals of the north loggia. However, while it is likely that Fancelli designed the inner frame of the front door, it is not certain that he designed the door as a whole, or the window frame. In the door, the combination of decorative mouldings and plastic quantities is managed nicely. At the same time, it displays a quantity of archaeological knowledge.

There is reason to believe that Lodovico introduced these decorative elements, as his enthusiasm for the all'antica style warmed, against a background of some opposition from local craftsmen. For personal reasons, the style was suitable to his palace. It has been suggested that his appreciation of the style derived from its evocative power rather than its strictly formal quality, and that the same was the appeal of Mantegna's work, after 1459, when in all important respects the palace at Revere had ceased to receive Lodovico's attention.

However, although the details like doors and windows are all'antica, they were applied to a structure that was not originally designed to carry them. The palace bears allusions to earlier artistic and practical purposes. From the outside, thanks to its towers and crenellations, it looks distinctly castle-like. It is true that towers and crenellations, which nowadays at the palace point to the incompleteness of the view of the antique that otherwise it represents, were not considered anti-classical in the 15th century.²⁴⁵

Antique remains were furnished with them often enough.²⁴⁶ And Mantegna's painted backgrounds frequently contain buildings that are towered and crenellated (Fig. 90). But at Revere, the towers and crenellations draw attention to a typological link with castle-palaces that were not intended to be classicizing buildings. In a typological sense, the building is ambiguous, possessing characteristics of a castle, of a country house and of a town palace.

The fact that all'antica details appear alongside the castellated features that finish off the upper edges of the building shows that they were not necessarily antagonistic towards one another. The question that poses itself is whether there were terms in which they were both congenial to Lodovico's purposes.

V. The Completion of the Structure of the Palace. Functions
and Typological Identifications.

1. The Growth of the Palace.

It is difficult, even given the large number of documentary references, to gain a clear idea of how work at Revere progressed. The meaning of documents is usually unclear. Obviously, the laying of floors implies the existence of walls to support them, but usually their whereabouts are not specified. Letters concerning the carving of window frames allow the general inference that stretches of wall were rising to accommodate them. Letters do not necessarily give an accurate impression of the progress of work, for it need not always have been necessary for letters to be written as work continued. The vicar received his instructions. His correspondence with the court does not survive in its entirety. When Lodovico was on site, he could attend to work personally and, except when materials or workers were wanting, had little reason to put pen to paper. But, though the picture that the documents describe is doubtless distorted and is often blurred, they would, if they could be interpreted correctly, indicate its general lines.

The work appears to have advanced in a complicated manner. In August 1451, for example, the painter, Domenico, was at work (Doc. 97),²⁴⁷ the stone-carver, Antonio, was expected and had prepared stone for a small room (Doc. 100), and the delivery of 50,000 bricks was ordered (Doc. 102). Following the progress of work is not made easier by the fact that it is not always clear whether letters of the early 1450s refer to work at

Revere or Ponte Molino, near Ostiglia.²⁴⁸ The 50,000 bricks may have been needed for the second job. The advance was also fitful. So, the rate at which the palace grew before the mind's bird's-eye view is difficult to gauge. Work was repeatedly interrupted. It may have taken second place to other, more important projects. That appears to have been the case on 8th October, 1451, when Lodovico wrote to his brother, Alessandro, listing works in hand at the time - "al predella e Pontemolino ala chiaraega, ala chiaraega de cantone de abba e ad uno sostogno che si fa a Razolo" (Doc.103) - and omitting any mention of Revere, and was the case on 3rd May, 1458, when he explained to the vicar that he would attend to work on the palace when less pressed by concern with other projects under way (Doc.188). Or, work may have been held up by the want of materials, as on 12th November, 1451, when the vicar wrote to Filippino de Grossis asking him to negotiate with Albertino de Pavesi on his behalf the provision of nails, "... perche venendo qui lo Illu. et. Ex. S. nostro et ritrovando li maestri stare indarno per dicta casone (the lack of nails) (credo) (sic) se corezaria et maxime ritrovando non esser finiti alcuni solari che ordinoe la Sua S. subiti se facesseno" (Doc.106). As has been seen, work on windows was interrupted in April, 1452 (Doc.113), when the Venetians would not allow the transit of stone from Ferrara. There were delays at other times.

It is the state of the palace nowadays which suggests a loose order of events. Work of the early 1450s, it has been argued above, concentrated upon the north wing. Less attention

was paid to the exterior walls of the east and west wings to the south of the towers. There, windows placed according to the horizontal divisions of the north facade seem to be roughly equal in size to the framed windows but are, themselves, unframed and were evidently never intended to be so (Fig. 22). One reason for this may have been that these facades, being of secondary importance, did not merit the attention lavished upon the principal facade. That they were, indeed, of secondary importance is proved by the absence of counterscarps expressing the towers when viewed from east and west. Another reason may be that money and enthusiasm were running short for their completion in the same finished manner as the north facade. Both reasons would suggest that the side walls were raised above the level of the older remains after the building of the north facade. At that time, it was already decided that they should not carry stone-framed windows. The north facade had reached its full height when the upper walls of the east and west wings were built, for, otherwise, it would be expected that the crenellations would be the same size all round the perimeter of the building. But those of the side wings, like the ones in the courtyard, are bigger than those of the north facade and the towers.²⁴⁹ Either the number of bricks used or their size was altered. The north facade was probably near completion in 1457. Work on the side wings should be supposed to date after that. Before 1457, as work concentrated upon the north wing, the side wings would have stood unaltered, substantially, from that older form that Lodovico probably inherited. Named rooms on which work was done before the end of 1457 would be

likely to be found in the north wing.

If the number of letters referring to work in progress or planned during the years 1452, 1453 and 1454 are anything to go by, little was done at Revere. On 10th September, 1453, the vicar was instructed to make a reserve stock-pile of bricks "presso ala torre" (Doc. 122). These bricks were not to be supplied to other jobs.²⁵⁰ Perhaps the tower mentioned was the northwest one and the same in which, on 15th May, 1453, the vicar wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg that he had constructed a vaulted space in which salt could be stored (Doc. 119). The floor remained to be paved, and on 27th May, he wrote that that had been done (Doc. 120).²⁵¹ The vicar was also instructed to acquire lime on 10th September. So, it appears that it was intended to carry out building work in the near future.²⁵² On 17th September, another letter was written to the vicar, repeating the instruction and refuting an objection made by the vicar that it was not possible to stack the bricks beside the tower (Doc. 123).

A letter of 8th January, 1454, if correctly interpreted, should be particularly informative about the progress of work. Rolandino della Volta, Lodovico's factor general, was instructed to see to the provision of wood for Revere (Doc. 125). It was not required immediately but was to be prepared for when it would be required.²⁵³ Under five headings, wood was listed for use in three parts of the work.

Nine beams, twenty braccia long, would be made for the Sala. They would be over thirty feet long. Running across the breadth of a space they would have spanned the distance between

the wall supported by the columns of the north portico of the courtyard and its north wall. (All three wings are narrower than 30 feet). It may, of course, have been intended to arrange the beams in some other way, but the number, nine, does give rise to the possibility of making several different arrangements. Laid lengthwise in three groups of three, they must be supposed to be supported at four points - that is, there would have to have been four walls running breadthwise on the level below. A room of something less than 60 braccia or 90 feet in length would have been created. Such a room could not be accommodated to the existing walls. The beams visible in the west wing are placed about six feet apart and run parallel with the external walls. It is unlikely that nine such heavy beams were required to run lengthwise down a room of less than 30 feet. More likely, the Sala was one of the rooms above the north vault. On the upper floor, walls running north-south make a row of small rooms. A central corridor runs the length of the wing between the towers. It has not been possible to study the building on the level of the offices of the Questura below. Walls on the upper level are not necessarily contemporary with the construction work of the 1450s. The absence of adequate support for walls in the vaulting of the north portico suggests the possibility that walls were not originally proposed in the spaces above, and that that Sala occupied the whole space between the towers to the south of the wing-dividing wall. In the space under the roof, over the north portico, beams run in a north-south direction and support light pressure vaults. Something similar may be found on the piano nobile level.²⁵⁴ Twice the

number of beams, half the length, were required "per far coverte...". Laid on top of the twenty braccia beams, which measured 10br." by 9br." in section, the woodwork would occupy 20br." or, more likely if the $1\frac{1}{2}$ br. mentioned in Document 40 "pro infondratura traborum" was a detail of conventional building practice, 18br.". The north portico was probably built by this time and the piano nobile floor was probably laid. The twenty braccia beams probably ceiled the Sala and floored the room above. Nine beams would divide the space between the towers into ten units of length. As had been seen, the distance $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. (between the wings) is simply divisible by 10. Beams laid on points established by the division of the distance, $53\frac{1}{3}$, would be 64br." apart. A room the whole $53\frac{1}{3}$ br. long would have trabeation interspaces longer at the ends than elsewhere - at 59br." instead of 54br." because the end walls would mark the axes of the intervals. The problem could be solved by adding 10br." to the length of the space and dividing the total by 10, so that the inter-trabeation was 65br." and the walls at each end would be supposed to contain a half beam's width as, on the level of the portico, the side walls may be supposed to contain a half column width. The choice of 10br." beams could have followed from this intention for it is the only suitable width that, added to the distance between the wings, would not prevent the total length being divisible by 10. Of interest, perhaps, is the observation that nine beams placed 64br." apart (i. e. from axis to axis) would fall at assorted points above the arches of the portico, taking no account of strong and weak parts of the arcade, but would fall above columns and keys of an arcade

of five arches (Fig. 91).²⁵⁵ If the requisition for beams did take account of the supposed old design, and not the arcuation of the present portico, the re-designing of c. 1450 was not thorough-going.

The third item of the requisition was for ten beams each fifteen braccia in length. They could have been used in any of the three wings, though, for reasons offered above, the north wing was their most likely location. If the rooms for which they were intended were of the same dimensions, then, since they would each use the same number of beams, either two or five rooms were being considered. But if nine beams, 20br. long, running breadthwise, could make one room, ten beams, 15 br. long, running in the same direction, would, if they were placed the same distance apart, make two rooms whose lengths, added together, would exceed the length of the Sala. They could not have been found on the same level, for the length of the Sala is the maximum length that the palace can accommodate (if the Sala did indeed occupy the whole area above the north portico). Five rooms, each using two beams placed similarly, would occupy yet more space. At three inter-trabeations' length, rooms would be about 16br. long and so could be in any of the square rooms of that size in the palace; like the corner tower rooms or the two rooms in the west wing, one over the side entrance and the other to the north of it. It is quite possible that the beams were placed differently and that the rooms, either square or rectangular, may be found in the building. But, because that possibility implies an uneconomic building method, it is fair to regard it with some scepticism and

proceed to investigate the consequences of the suggestion that the beams were required for two or more rooms in the north wing.

If the rooms behind the north facade used the inter-trabeation that is suggested for the space above the north portico, seven beams placed 64br." apart would be used on one level and the remaining three could be used for one of the larger rooms on another level. However, if the inter-trabeation was reduced because of the shorter span of the wings of the building - in the interests of proportionality with the Sala - it would be possible to use four beams for each of the two large rooms behind the north facade. Figure 90 suggests ways in which the beams may have been placed at the north end of the building. The relationship of inter-trabeation to beam length above the north portico is 64br." to 240br." (20br.) or 4:15. The rooms behind the north facade are 240br." long in the drawing. The axes of four beams placed in each of those spaces would be 48br." apart. The relationship of inter-trabeation to beam length is 48br." to 180br." (15br.) or 4:15. (Where intertrabeations were 65br." and 50br." respectively, their relationships to beam length would at 13:48 and 5:18 be not quite equal. Of course, $17\frac{1}{3}$ br. and $13\frac{1}{3}$ br. of beam would be actually visible in the rooms. The ratio of these lengths is 13:10. 65br." to 50br." is expressible as the same ratio).

Of course, such arrangements of 15br. beams - for the sake of proportionality - serve an aesthetic purpose rather than a structural one. The stability of the structure does not demand a shorter intertrabeation for 15br. beams of the same thickness as 20br. beams.²⁵⁶ Two beams are left over, perhaps to be put, one

each, in the small axial rooms on piano nobile level and above.

But 6 also divides into 240br." (though not into 250br."). With five beams in each of the large rooms behind the north facade, the relationship of intertrabeation - 40br." - to beam length is not shared with the Sala. However, all the ten beams would be used up on one level. Another arrangement may be more suitable.

Two rooms, each lit by two windows, about 30 feet long and about 20 feet wide, could have each used five beams 15 braccia long. The arrangement that is being suggested is shown in Figure 91, is simple, and follows from the placing of walls before the adoption of the plan for the present courtyard and the truly grandiose Sala. The palace, as it rose, probably continued to follow two separable designs. When the beams were in place, it would have been as high as the ceiling level of the piano nobile or the level above on the facade side of the north wing and as high as the ceiling of the piano nobile on the courtyard side.

The ten mouldings - the "pianete per metter ali solari della tor longi braccia x e onzie 8 e 9 per quadra a filo" - mentioned at the end of the requisition must have been intended to be placed, if indeed in the palace, to the south of the tower-dividing walls, for the tower rooms are about 20 feet square, and 10 braccia is about 15 feet.

Work continued on the north wing (Doc. 143), and it appears to have been raised to its full height by 13th July, 1455, when the vicar was instructed to pay for "...tute quelle opere che metterà Zohanne Antonio nostro marangone per descoprire quello nostro palazzo" (Doc. 134). Part of the palace - probably the north wing -

was to be roofed. On 2nd October, 1455, the Factor General was advised to acquire "sei pesi de olio de linosa da adoperarlo a certi lavoreri de questo nostro palazzo" (Doc. 140). If not to be had locally, it was to be got in the Cremonese and supplied to Gian Antonio. The preparation of wood for painted decoration comes to mind.²⁵⁷ The painter, Domenico, who had been at Revere in August, 1451 (Doc. 97) had been en route there on 12th September, 1455 (Doc. 137). Zanebello and brothers from Ferrara had offered to provide 160 'opere' for the palace. The offer was too good to refuse and Lodovico accepted it, abandoning "la inquisizione contra lor formata" (Doc. 153).

In 1455, work also seems to have been done in the east tower. On 24th September, the vicar was told to try to put in "quelle tre finestre morte che vano sopra la camera di spiritelli ..."(Doc. 138). Shortly afterwards, on 25th October, work was being done on the facade (Doc. 142). Unless the dead windows were temporary, it is difficult to imagine that they were in the facade. The 'guardacamera daj spiritellj' was mentioned in a letter of 9th March, 1452 (Doc. 109) when the building was raised to a less considerable height than in 1455. Dead windows are to be found only on the flank of the northeast tower. There are three on the top level and one on each of the lower levels, though the restorer of the building has left evidence that the four lower ones were opened later (Fig. 37).

On 26th October, 1455, Lodovico who, the day before, had wanted to know "in che termine se ritrova la fazada denanci" (Doc. 142) mentioned the room of the sprites once again - this time

hinting at its location in the building (Doc. 143). Preparations were to be made for a visit by Count Galeazzo. Forty planks would be sent by Albertino or else could perhaps be acquired at Ostiglia. The vicar and Gian Antonio were asked to finish the 'camera grande sopra quella dali spiritelli de finestre, usci et letera' as well as the other, probably on the same level. This area was the same as that in which the dead windows were to be put on 24th September. A wooden staircase going up to the 'Sala di sopra' was to be constructed and, at a later time, would serve when work would be done on both the 'Sala' and the 'camera' on that level. If the terminology of the letter is consistent with that of the letter of 8th January, 1454, and the interpretation of that letter is correct, the 'Sala di sopra' would be the upper-level room above the north portico and the 'camera', one of the rooms lit by two windows of the facade between the towers on that level. However, camera is a less explicit word than sala, and several room-sizes would have justified its use. Camera grande would better describe a large room behind the north facade, rather than a square corner room in one of the towers, but does not seem to have been used to make that distinction if the 'camera dali spiritelli' was, indeed, in the east tower. Should it be impossible to finish the staircase - is what is probably meant - the upper 'camera', perhaps the 'camera grande', should not be worked on for there would be no means of getting into it. In the meantime, the furnishings of the 'Sala prima' - the large room below the 'Sala di sopra' - should receive attention. The 'Sala prima' would be on the piano nobile along with the 'camera dali spiritelli', it seems. The three dead

windows of the letter of 24th September belonged to the 'camera grande sopra quella dali spiritelli' and also, perhaps to the other 'camera'. Figure 92 shows how the rooms may have been arranged.

Work on the south side of the north wing may have been lagging behind work on the north side, for there was talk, on 26th October, 1455, of removing scaffoldings from the north facade. Perhaps doorways joining the two parts were filled in at this time and it was not possible to pass from the 'Sala di sopra' to the rooms on the north side. Though unfinished, the 'Sala di sopra' existed, so the south wall of the north wing was built to the height of, at least, the base of the crenellations. The nearly-finished facade must have been raised at least to an equal height, and the windows have been put in place. The towers were not necessarily built to their full height.

The documents do not provide information about building activity during the next half year. On 15th June, 1456, work seems to have been in progress near the roof of the building, for the vicar had reported that certain lengths of wood for tie-beams - 'corde de chiave' - were twisted and Gian Antonio was sent down to attend to the matter (Doc. 146). Luca Fancelli returned to Revere and continued to work on stone carving from late 1456 to late 1457. (Docs. 150, 155, 161, 167). On 31st October, 1456, he had produced two chimney pieces and was about to have them installed (Doc. 154). One was for the 'camera nostra de la sala' and the other was for the 'camera de la volta'. Lorenzo 'tayapetra' had made doorways for the 'camera de la volta' in 1450 (Doc. 68). If they had any carved detailing, their style would have contrasted with that of the

chimney piece, for Lorenzo was a northern Italian craftsman who was old enough to have worked for Gianfrancesco Gonzaga.²⁵⁸ Also he may have been responsible for the form of the columns and capitals at Revere. The 'camera nostra de la sala' was probably on the piano nobile.²⁵⁹ It would have been south of the wing-dividing wall near where the Sala was situated and in the west tower. The corresponding room on the east side of the building was probably the 'guardacamera daj spiritellj' (Doc. 109). But then, should not a diminutive also have been used? The same objection would apply in the case of another possible location for the 'camera nostra de la sala' - the small axial room behind the north facade. Unfortunately, it is not possible to be at all confident in making suggestions regarding the whereabouts of these and other rooms.²⁶⁰

Interior furnishings and a window were the subject of a letter of 8th August, 1457 (Doc. 162). The window, probably that whose installation was begun on 3rd August, was in place. So were the doors of the Sala (Doc. 161), probably the 'Sala di sopra' upon which, on 26th October, 1455, work remained to be done (Doc. 143). The vicar was instructed not to move the doorways of the 'camera' because there would be insufficient time to repair them before Count Galeazzo's return to Revere. Doorways existed already. The intention may have been to move the framings, or the openings themselves. In the first place - an unlikely one at this stage - a stylistic change may have been proposed. In the second, a more practical consideration may have motivated the change. Another possibility is that material which blocked the doorways giving access from the Sala to the 'camere' would, in

the future, be removed. A fireplace was ready to be installed in the 'camera di spiritelli'. Since 1452, at least, the room had its name and had possessed that which, probably of a decorative nature, warranted its use. It may have been part of the 'old' palace and have been a mixture of old and new, like the 'camera della volta'. The terracotta-framed window of the piano nobile, on the east tower's north face, is topped by a pressure arch in the brickwork (Fig. 68). It is displaced somewhat to the right and may point to the existence of an earlier window. The 'camera dali spiritelli', it has been suggested, was lit by that window.

By 14th March 1458, a part, at least, of the upper floor was habitable, for Lodovico's secretary wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg, "Heri sera ... volse (Lodovico) andar a dormire introe ne la guardacamaretta de la camera sua de sopra cum messer francisco e Bochalino..." (Doc. 180). One of the small rooms adjacent to a tower corner room comes to mind.

2. The Building of the Side Wings.

In spring 1458, attention turned to the side wings. On 17th March, the vicar wrote to Lodovico about preparations he was making for the start of building work. He had asked for 100 planks - "grade pro murare"- probably for scaffoldings. Two hundred dowels or wedges for the construction of scaffoldings were required, but proved - and continued to prove - difficult to acquire (Doc. 182). On 7th April, he repeated more or less what he had written in March, adding that he had sent for 160 measures of lime (Doc. 183). Lodovico's letter of reply of 9th April (Doc. 184) locates the whereabouts of the proposed building work. He asked to be informed when the materials would be collected and when Lorenzo "habia compite quelle prede de mettere suxo quelle colone dal canto de la". Probably, Lorenzo was contracted to make the lintels that support the barrel vaults of the side portico bays. Neither Lorenzo nor the stone had arrived by 12th April, 1458, and the lime had not been delivered (Doc. 185). Lime and sand 'a sufficientia' were on site on 1st May, but the dowels or wedges and Lorenzo were still unavailable (Doc. 186). Lorenzo's arrival would be delayed until he had finished another job (Doc. 187). Lodovico wrote to the vicar on 3rd May, explaining that work could not start before the end of June because Lorenzo had been detained by Galeazzo da Pii (Doc. 188). At other times so insistent upon haste, he was not, on this occasion, disturbed by the delay, for works in progress nearer Mantua were claiming his attentions. Later, "meglio haveremo", he wrote, "el modo de attenderli" (Doc. 188).

In the meantime, the vicar attended to the paving of rooms. He wrote, in a postscript to a letter of 30th May, 1458, to Lodovico, that the paving of the Sala was ugly and that, given permission, he would re-pave it with the thin square tiles used in other rooms. He suggested that the upper Sala, "perche non havesse tanto carico", be paved with the thinner 'tavolle' (Doc. 192).²⁶¹ Lodovico wrote back on 1st June, 1458, agreeing with the vicar's suggestion but specifying that on the piano nobile level the Sala - "quella di mezo" - be paved with 6" 'quadreleti' which were thicker than the 'tavolle', suitable for the 'Sala di sopra', and thinner than the 'quadreli'.²⁶² (Doc. 194). The vicar started work on the 'Sala di sopra' and was awaiting the delivery of the 6" tiles from the furnace on 21st June (Doc. 197). On 6th July, he was at work on the Sala of the piano nobile where the 6" tiles were to be used and sought advice on what size was to be used for the chapel (Doc. 198). The choice was between the 6" 'quadreleto', the 8" 'quadro' and the 'quadrelo' (Doc. 198). Lodovico replied that the 6" tiles should be used. (Doc. 199). Clearly, the 6" tiles were reserved for the most important rooms.

Although Lorenzo had promised, on 14th June, 1458, that he would soon be able to return to the Mantovano and "far cose che piazza al a nostra Signoria" (Doc. 196),²⁶³ building work had still not begun at Revere in September. However, it is likely that, by then, he had worked the stones, for lime had been fired and was in danger of being wasted (Doc. 204). Earlier letters had contained advice and instruction to fire the lime fifteen days before the commencement of work (Docs. 186, 188). Gian Antonio da Rezo

'inzignero' was expected and should have been at Revere more than eight days earlier (Doc.204). Luca Fancelli, who was at Revere on the 8th of the month, appears to have taken no part in the work that involved the building of the side portico. Had he been responsible for its design, he might be expected to have taken charge of its execution. He was probably engaged on more important work - the carving of furnishings and details. One hundred of the three (sic) hundred 'taselli' required were to be had at Viadana (Docs.204,205). On 30th September, those logistical difficulties that had delayed the start of building had still not been overcome, for neither Gian Antonio nor the 'taselli' had arrived. Already, the fortnight within which work should have started had elapsed (Doc.206). The vicar received a letter, written on the same day, reassuring him that Gian Antonio and the dowels or wedges would arrive (Doc.207). The vicar was to receive one hundred wedges or dowels instead of two hundred (Doc.183), or three hundred (Doc.204). Is it possible that he required wedges for scaffoldings, that he would only be able to erect one half or one third of the proposed length, and that the unfinished east wing is to be associated with this shortage?

Work did start and, on 21st October, was going forward on "quello muro ... verso la via" (Doc.210). Roads pass on both sides of the palace, so it is not clear from the letter which side was the scene of activity. The west wing is longer than the east wing where work petered out just beyond the blocked up side entrance. If both wings remained to be built to their present height in 1458, work probably concentrated upon the west wing.

That wing would have been the first to be built, if it is correctly inferred from the documents that one wing or a part of one was built at the time. The vicar was advised not to raise that outside wall as high as the wall above the north portico where extra height gave extra stability to the vault. At least that is what Lodovico seems to have been referring to. Alternatively, he could have been referring to the wall that separates the rooms and the corridors of one of the side wings. When the wall would be raised to the level of the eaves, Lodovico wanted to be informed and he would then give instructions regarding what needed to be done so that the rafters that Gian Antonio was preparing could be put in place. The vicar wrote on 6th November that the walls above the stair and the rooms were constructed up to roof level and attention would be turned to the construction of the vaults, probably of the side portico. Scaffolding had already been dismantled for, while he was doing that, a bricklayer had broken his leg and was expected to die of his injury (Doc.211). The inner courtyard wall above the side arcade clearly remained to be built. This seems to imply that on 21st October the wall referred to was that between corridors and rooms (Doc.210). However, it is possible that the vaults of the portico of the side wing in question were built in several stages. By 16th November 1458, work had already progressed satisfactorily, for Marsilio Andreasi wrote to Barbara of "il lavorero che c' e facto che a mea e molto bene a comparire" (Doc.213).

The side wings seem to have been built in two phases. First, they were built southwards to a point just beyond the side

entrance doors. The east wing was not completed beyond that point. In the corridor running the length of the west wing at piano nobile level, the wall above the arcade is thinned down by about 6", or a header, at the same place. And the wall backing the portico below (about 4'5" or 1.346m. south of the side entrance) has a seam in it (Fig. 50). Also, on the corridor of the piano nobile, shallow pressure vaults, running at right angles to the direction of the corridor, ceil it southwards to a point just before the line of the fissure. Further to the south the ceiling is flat. There does seem to have been a change in plan just south of the side entrance. However, it is not possible to identify with any confidence, in the damaged wall of the west facade, a definite break corresponding with that which appears in the west portico backing wall. Windows of the old, terracotta framed type are to be seen to the south of the west entrance (Fig. 12 and Pocket Drawing 2). Their presence suggests that the whole length of the west wing was established, in its lower reaches, before the building campaign of 1458. It is not possible to say whether the building campaign under discussion was involved with wall to north and south of the break that is noticeable at corridor level. There are no obvious breaks in the upper exterior brickwork of the west wing, in line with the change at corridor level, and corresponding with the break in the east wing. The documents suggest that one side rather than both sides was the scene of activity. But both wings, as far from the north as the side entrances, seem to be part of the same building programme. For example, there is a rather odd feature of the northernmost arches of the side porticos

that, though it may be otherwise explainable, suggests their contemporaneity. Both arches are broken into by scaffolding holes (Figs. 93, 47). Perhaps a mis-calculation had been made in constructing scaffoldings. The mistake on one side could have been rectified on the other if an interval of time had elapsed between the raising of the two arcade walls. So, either the work of 1458 attended to the west wing as far as the side entrance and proposed to treat the east wing similarly straight away, or there was no building campaign later than that of 1458 and, before that time, both wings were finished as far as the side entrances - the campaign of 1458 being the continuation of the west wing to its present length and height, perhaps with some in-filling wall at ground level.

About this time, the palace was close to the state of completion in which the pope saw it in 1459 when en route to Mantua for the congress. Work probably continued up to the last moment, but documents found in the Mantuan State Archive do not give further information about work done before the pope's arrival. Other projects, especially in Mantua, probably made demands upon stocks of materials and man-power at the time. The north wing was probably finished and a part, at least, of one of the side wings was built as it is seen now, while the lower parts of both wings almost certainly existed. The letter of 7th November, 1460, from the vicar to Lodovico (Doc. 229), in which the former wrote that he had told Lodovico's son how it was intended to finish the palace gives no further clue for, of course, it is still unfinished. However, more building work seems to have been proposed in 1467

when Johanne Antonio de Rippari wrote to Lodovico about a quantity of bricks,²⁶⁴ "che ho fatto condurre al pallazo", and asked how many more would be needed (Doc.241). On 14th March, 1468, the same writer passed on to Lodovico information about the existence at S. Giovanni de le Carette of four columns "fornite che vanno qui al palazzo".²⁶⁵ In 1475, wood had been prepared for the palace. It was used instead for Lodovico's Bucentaur (Doc.245). Late work most likely involved the raising of the short east wing, or perhaps the building of the portico south from the line of the south entrance. Ariosto described the palace as a four-square symmetrical building with arcades going round all four sides of the courtyard.²⁶⁶ He reconstructed and elaborated the building imaginatively but in the unfinished building there were clues upon which his imagination could work. It is unlikely that he saw less than the contemporary visitor sees.

The end result of this complicated building process - a process interrupted and fitful, carried on by a multitude of seemingly itinerant workmen, one of adaption of newer parts to older, of contemporary work on different parts, of changing artistic priorities - is a structure that bears evidence of some of these aspects of the process. An obvious discontinuity that strikes the eye of the contemporary visitor, for example, is that between the castellated structure viewed as a whole and the aspect of the stone-carved details. While the north facade rose and to it was given, in the fragile detailing, a certain air of delicate refinement, features that imply fortification - if they do not actually provide for defence in this case - waited to trim the top edge. The choice

of all'antica detail did not supercede the desire for a castellated appearance. What is perplexing to the modern viewer is that the classicizing detail carries no implication of the 'castle' whatsoever, and that it weakens the effect of any fortified aspect.²⁶⁷ Though, at Revere, the 'ancient style' replaced the traditional local one, it did not replace the symbols of strength and security which, evidently, were not out-moded in 1457. They co-exist unhappily nowadays.²⁶⁸ In some respects, the palace resembles a town house and in others it resembles a castle. Perhaps the villa, as described by Patzak, Swoboda and Ackerman,²⁶⁹ is the reconciliation of the castle's strength and the more peaceable aspect of the town house.

3. General and Particular Functions of the Castle and
Palace at Revere.

The territory of Mantua (Fig. 20) was administered regionally by district governors, or vicars. The duties of the vicars were in two general connections. One was the constant and universal exercise of the jurisdiction that Lodovico, as marquis, had from the Holy Roman Empire. The other may be presumed - where and when Lodovico was individual owner of tenanted lands within administrative regions.

Lodovico was a landowner of considerable substance. Under the terms of the will of his father, Gian Francesco, possessions were to be split among the sons. Arrangements were also made, in the events of the brothers' deaths, for properties to pass in all cases to designated surviving brothers.²⁷⁰ However, Gian Francesco added the proviso, "...est animadvertum quod ego consideravi Lodovici partem pinguiorum et longe maiorem esse, et merito tum quia primogenitus est tum respectu imperialis privilegij".²⁷¹ Lodovico acquired Borgoforte "oltre Po" when Gian Francesco died on 24th September 1444.²⁷² The other Gonzaga properties "oltre Po" passed to Carlo.²⁷³ Lodovico took actual possession of Carlo's properties after 17th March 1451, when the latter went into the military services of Venice, having been released from imprisonment by Francesco Sforza on Lodovico's undertaking that he would cease to oppose Sforza as ruler of Milan. Lodovico had stood guarantor for Carlo's good behaviour for the sum of 80,000 ducats, so he confiscated Carlo's properties.²⁷⁴ Carlo died in 1456.²⁷⁵ Lodovico outlived all his

brothers and, with their deaths, increased his land holdings.²⁷⁶

However, where and when Lodovico owned properties, that is to be seen as of secondary importance when what is being considered is the scale of the administrative presence as it would be indicated by buildings. The administrative presence was necessary independently of who owned the land. This is clear from the coda added to the contract of 20th November 1449, between Lodovico and Alfonso of Aragon. Protection was promised to Gonzaga territories: "... i quali stati sono perho una cossa medesima e cossi sempre doppo la morte de la felice memoria del Illustrissimo quondam signor suo patre sono stati reputati, tractati et governati indifferenter".²⁷⁷ In other words, Lodovico had jurisdiction where he did not own property.

In fact, the government of the territories functioned with regard to the land, even where it was not owned by Lodovico, and the agents of central government, the vicars, fulfilled an administrative role with regard to local agriculture, as well as bureaucratically, judicially and fiscally. For example, farmers were obliged to deposit for safekeeping in the local state granary a proportion of their grain harvest.²⁷⁸ Flour was stored within the castle compound at Revere in a similar manner (Doc. 236). In respect of local agriculture, the function of the castle at Revere was manorial, though not necessarily proprietorial. Insofar as administration was concerned, the size of the population of the associated town and region would be a more significant function of the size of the urbanistic, castle-like complex presided over by

the vicar.

The castle at Revere was the centre of an administrative region and was governed by a vicar. In these respects, it did not differ from other centres, like Cavriana, Goito, Castel Mantovano etc., which were similarly governed, and where similar jurisdiction was exercised on Lodovico's behalf. Revere's geographical location, however, distinguished it from other centres, and enabled and required its castle to fulfil certain other functions, both peaceful and military. It was located close to the borders of the territory and was a military complex guarding and controlling these borders more or less forcefully, depending upon the state of relations with neighbours. As has been noted above, it was paired with Ostiglia, on the left bank of the Po, during Lodovico's rule²⁷⁹ to control river traffic and secure an obvious passage through the territory's defences in times of war. Sited at a narrow part of the river, Revere was also a crossing place for traffic going north and south by land. In times of peace, Revere was a customs post, and river traffic that, in times of war, was prevented by an arrangement of wooden piles and chains²⁸⁰ from passing up the Mincio to threaten Mantua, was obliged to pay duty on cargo.²⁸¹ Land traffic going north and south was similarly controlled.²⁸² Thus, the administrative duties of the vicar were increased in number. Strategic and administrative purposes were served by the castle. In both respects, its functions were, by virtue of its geographical location, more onerous than at many other places.

Carpeggiani distinguishes between two kinds of strategic

building of the territory of Mantua.²⁸³ One group consisted of buildings whose purpose was rather one of control and alarm than defence. These buildings stood on principal byways of land and water, and were those that the Gonzaga used as accommodation on their travels round the territory. At the same time, there was a system of strongholds with purely military purpose. The country residences, as opposed to strongholds, were "corte rurale" and were "l'organizzazione economico-urbanistica propria del contado".²⁸⁴ They possessed, as well as residential quarters, such provisions appropriate to their rural status as mills and granaries. They were also "corte di governo", where the ruler could perform his political and administrative functions. Thus, an economic chain of autonomous rural properties complemented a military-strategic one.

Carpeggiani describes, as part of such an economic chain of buildings, the castle at Revere, "La Ghirardina" at Motteggiana and the palace at Portiolo. However, there is no evidence that the Gonzaga were directly associated with the building at Motteggiana, nor that they used it either as the centre of an administrative region or as a "corte di governo".²⁸⁵ The important castle of Borgoforte stood nearby, though, indeed, it is on the north side of the Po - a suitable barrier, probably, between administrative regions. "La Ghirardina" does have the character of a manor ("l'organizzazione economico-urbanistica propria del contado"). Revere, however, contained the functions that the manor supposes - the more or less self-sufficient and therefore villa-like focus of husbandry of the land²⁸⁶ - alongside other important ones. However, its strategic

and administrative importance, determined by its location, probably made the castle, as an element in the economic and defensive network of Gonzaga properties, a centre that would not be abandoned lightly in times of war. In a letter to the vicar of Revere, Lodovico referred to "la importancia del luoco", though he did not specify in what respect (Doc.90). That its importance was in association with its fortified nature may be inferred from its pairing with Ostiglia - assuredly the element of the combination of more strictly military significance (Doc.62). However, such was the scale of the complex at Revere, that its importance was surely more strategic than simply tactical. (It may be remarked that, in time of war, the arrangement of piles and chains preventing the passage of river traffic, needed firm protection, for, without protection, it was an inefficient defensive device). In other words, the castle at Revere seems to have occupied both Carpeggiani's categories and others besides.

The location of the castle of Revere on the intersection of two paths - the river and the road passing from the south to Ostiglia - close to the border of the territory enabled it to serve two other functions. One was as a quarantine station.²⁸⁷ This function was served insofar as the castle was a general urbanistic complex.²⁸⁸ The other was one concerning specifically the palace in the castle. It was as a guest house, giving hospitality to travellers using one or other of the thoroughfares.²⁸⁹

The palace, contained within the castle, introduced an extra magnificent element into the complex. It dignified the town and increased its urban status. It may also have invested the

vicar with a certain extra degree of authority. When Pius II visited, the palace was adequate to a grand state occasion, and the pope's retinue was large.²⁹⁰ There is pomp in the use of 20 monolithic marble columns and 8 half columns.²⁹¹ There is a certain pomp too in the use of timbers 20 braccia long. They would be worthy of the nave of a respectably-sized church. As a guest house, the palace was an object of display, and Lodovico was ready to show it to distinguished visitors.²⁹² It was also probably a suitable setting for the display of liberality.

Sissa called the palace a summer residence.²⁹³ He identified the building as having a recreational purpose. Indeed, a generally pleasurable purpose, among the others mentioned, may possibly be inferred from the use of so many columns, such timbers, the rich stone-carved decoration, and some of the painted decorations inside.²⁹⁴ It is consistent with the purpose of guest houses. However, Lodovico possibly saw such magnificence merely as a corollary of his ruling function. It would be necessary to gain some idea of what his other country residences were like before it would be possible to address the question of the relationship between Lodovico's recreational purpose and his regal one, insofar as the scale, magnificence and luxury of his palaces are concerned. In the meantime, it may be remarked that scale, magnificence and luxury do not distinguish sharply between pleasure and regality for, what privately is luxury, publicly is magnificence.

There is no discernible pattern to the times and periods of Lodovico's sojourns at Revere. So, it is not certain that the building was a summer residence. That it was such may be unlikely,

for, beside a large body of rather sluggishly running water, Revere was not probably pleasant and refreshing in summer. Cavriana, on a hill, was probably more agreeable. Although the palace at Revere was a residence, it is not clear that it made any specific provision, and that Lodovico used it for any specific personal purpose that could not be served elsewhere. Lodovico travelled much round his territory. Presumably, he attended to matters of local administration. However, his correspondence deals with affairs in the Mantovano and abroad - in places where he was not to be found at the time of writing. Therefore, one of his principal activities at Revere, as elsewhere, was attending to the copious correspondence by which he ruled the territory and governed its relations abroad, and by means of which he had intelligence of events at home and abroad. By the nature of things, little is known of his precise activity at those places where he stayed.

Details of his activity were sometimes recounted by Lodovico's secretary, Marsilio Andreasi, in those letters that survive addressed to Barbara of Brandenburg. However, in most cases, Andreasi probably reported what was newsworthy rather than what was customary. So, on 14th July 1458, Marsilio reported the visit of the Bishop of Verona (Hermolao Barbaro)²⁹⁵ to Revere. After mass in the palace, Lodovico went to the nearby monastery of S. Lodovico Re di Francia to discuss the building work. He promised to supply a quantity of roof tiles.²⁹⁶ Then he returned to the palace and studied the facade (Doc. 200). On 4th August 1458, Marsilio was again at Revere with Lodovico. Lodovico spent the

day discussing with Gian Antonio (da Rezo) and Giovanni da Padova the works at Cavriana and Gonzaga. After dinner, he went out of the castle to make some kind of allocation of horses or cavalry. But he decided to postpone the task until the following day (Doc. 201). Marsilio wrote again from Revere on 16th November 1458. They had come to Revere to inspect work in progress (Doc. 213). Andreasi's letter of 17th September 1460, from Revere, is damaged, however, it appears that Lodovico spent the morning in his rooms (Doc. 227). Andreasi's letters show that Lodovico was much concerned with building work. Indeed, one of Lodovico's principal activities at Revere was probably overseeing the work in progress on the palace. His most frequent and lengthy visits coincide with the period in the early 1450s when work on the palace seems to have been most strenuous. That, and the fact that the building is unfinished may indicate that the palace served as an architectural exercise. Lodovico was clearly interested in building. Perhaps he became bored and frustrated with a project in which, by the end of the 1450s, archaisms could not be denied.

The peripatetic nature of Lodovico's court required suitable accommodation throughout the territory - though not necessarily on a large scale, for all administrative functions did not travel with Lodovico,²⁹⁷ and he often travelled without his family. On his travels, Lodovico was able to attend personally to local administration. At the same time, by means of letters, he was able to follow events in other districts and keep control of the administration of the whole territory. Insofar as these were his constant preoccupations, his activity at one palace was like

that at another. It is not clear from the remaining sources whether the palace at Revere made provision for activities of a recreational kind that were unavailable elsewhere. The palace and the castle were unique by virtue of their geographical location. Some of their functions derived from that location. Lodovico seems to have had ambitions for the region, the town, the castle and the palace in the 1450s. In that decade, Revere probably distinguished itself on account of the scale of that ambition. But, considered generally, as the centre of a unit of economic and political administration associated with a region, and as part of a strategic or tactical system of defence, the castle and palace at Revere should be regarded as typical.

4. The Palace as Castle.

The palace at Revere, three sides of an oblong with towers at two edges and crenellations running all round, has similarities with other castle-palaces that were not intended to be classicizing buildings. Its castellated features make it castle-like, but they do not fulfil the practical functions that their provision in conventional castles fulfills.

The military engineer has the task of exposing the attacker to danger. The palace has crenellations but they are not corbelled out from the faces of the walls to give them protection. Most are bricked up and, almost certainly, always were. Those that make windows into the spaces under the roofs are regularly placed. In-filled, the crenellations provide more secure support for the roofs, and the absence of gutters running through the lines of crenellations to take rain water running off lower or flat roofs, as on the Palazzo Castiglione in Mantua, suggests that roofs, like those found at present, were proposed at the same time as the crenellations. Their purpose, then, was decorative. They topped the building and created tonally enlivened passages of brickwork. However, that purpose could have been achieved more economically. The crenellations are elaborate and complicated works of brick-laying. They are, specifically and identifiably, crenellations with a typological as well as formal significance, and cause the building to be identified as 'castle'. Their purpose was more than just as formal decoration. The two towers lie flush with the facades. Small counterscarps give the towers, viewed from the north, support that is more visible than actual, and express the towers at the base

of the building. The towers are not otherwise expressed between ground level and the curtin battlements. The non-practical purpose of the masonry counterscarps is revealed by the fact that they do not continue down the sides of the towers. Towers, whose normal purpose is to protect lower, adjoining walls, here afford no such protection.

The basic type of castle with which Revere corresponds - that with a fortified exterior containing wings for the accommodation of large numbers, as opposed to the building whose rooms huddle behind heavy impenetrable walls²⁹⁸ - was common enough. In south Italy and Sicily, for example, a whole group of castles conform with this type. The castle of Goia del Colle in Apulia, Lagopesole and Catania in Sicily are representatives. They date to the 12th and 13th centuries.²⁹⁹ These castles are usually rectangular in plan, with corner towers breaking forward from the enceinte. Revere is, of course, a much later building but may bear the relationship of great-nephew to these examples. The type was also found in the 14th and 15th centuries in Lombardy. The planning of the palace at Revere seems to owe a debt to the four-square Lombard castles' organization. Visconti castles, like Vigevano and Pavia (Fig. 94) (which, like Revere, never received a fourth wing) are regularly-planned, have corner towers and provide space for accommodation in the wings.³⁰⁰ Like Revere, their principal defence was an outer system of fortifications. They themselves, again like Revere, were fortified palaces in castles and have a certain civilized domesticity about them.

In appearance, however, the palace at Revere has a mixed

character. Its general organization makes it resemble the Visconti type - castles like Pavia, Pandino³⁰¹ and Milan. But they are squatter. When viewed from a distance, the palace at Revere does have an impressive and lofty bulk. Its height does make apt the use of the word superbo by Cardinal Roteno when he visited it at the beginning of January, 1460.³⁰² Despite the actuality of its weakness and the stylistic ambiguities of its appearance, it does look rather awesomely castle-like from the outside. In this it resembles the Castel di S. Giorgio, built around 1395³⁰³ and the Castello Estensi in Ferrara finished in 1387.³⁰⁴ It is the height-to-width relationship of the walls between the towers that gives the effect of bulk to these buildings (though the two castles are more bulky in appearance than Revere because of the relative impenetrability of the walls in which few windows are opened). The very heavy compactness of the Castel di S. Giorgio - the relieved plasticity of its corner towers - and the extreme opacity of wall, found also in fortresses like Soncino, distinguish them from Revere and the Visconti palaces. (It must have been at an early date that the defensive character of the building at Revere was moderated - the towers lying flush with the walls). Revere has a lofty bulkiness in common with the Castle di S. Giorgio and distinguishable from the squat and open planning of the Visconti palaces. It shares with the latter a penetrability and domesticity given by the proliferation of windows and decorative details. It also shares a rectilinear planning. For example, the castle at Pavia, built from about 1370 onwards³⁰⁵ (not to mention Diocletian's palace at Split), has square rooms and square portico

bays in the courtyard. Before the present courtyard design was substituted at Revere, the plan of the palace would have resembled Pavia's more closely. In his treatise, Filarete paid a similar tribute to the Lombard type of castellated house. And he modified its squat and open proportions towards a lofty and, it seems, more urban character. The drawings of towered palace facades in the Treatise - the house of a gentleman, for example (Fig. 73) - have a proportion of towers to curtin that is close to that of Revere.

Calzecchi Onesti wrote that although the castle of Pavia was not conceived as a simple work of fortification but principally as a palace, nevertheless it had and could not but have important military characteristics because of its own structure and even more because of its location.³⁰⁶ Rocchi regarded the palace as a model of the style and defensive arrangements of the epoqe.³⁰⁷ Really, only the outer works provided genuine security. It is difficult to imagine the castle at Pavia and others with which it is related, including Revere, functioning effectively before an enemy that had enough determination to breach the outer line of defence. These castelli signorili were commodious, though they were, like keeps, the focal points of larger defensive complexes. The needs for which they made provision were not of a pessimistically warlike kind. They were centres of administrative as well as defensive complexes. They were not designed for war. Their details would be damaged.

The palace at Revere was rather less delicate in its details than the others mentioned. It is tall and rather opaque. But its effectiveness as a fortified building is also less. The palace

has no drawbridge or moat. It lacks the machicolations through which may be poured the boiling oil, hot sand and other weapons that elicit pity rather for the attacker than the besieged. The towers, lying flush, offer the walls no protection. Its castellated aspect was not the outcome of a practical defensive purpose.

Rocchi wrote that fortification is essentially, for historical reasons, a practical art.³⁰⁸ Practical requirements and formal solutions are obviously related as cause and effect. But where works of fortification are seen, not always are seen practical solutions to problems of defence. Revere's appearance, one that, at first glance, belies its defensive inadequacies, must be caused by other considerations. Details implicit of a defensive capability justified themselves on more than simply practical grounds.

One reason for their use - one that would have justified the careful execution of the crenellations - would be that they had a meaning independently of their practical fitness. Tradition, which may have maintained that all such buildings were similarly decorated, and the desire for a silhouette to harmonize with other structures of the defensive complex would also imply the existence of a more than merely practical significance for these details. At Revere, actual strength belonged to the outer defence works and the appearance of strength of the palace was already emasculated by the windows and the front door. The castellated aspect, because it does not give order to the whole building, is, in a way, residual, or revivalist. The forms that made it up could

exist notionally in isolation, for if they had existed contingently - in relationship with the other forms that belonged to castellated buildings the palace would have had an unequivocally military aspect or would have dispensed with them entirely. They had meaning like symbols whose existence anticipates their use and similarly exist in isolation. They do have their purposes but only within the terms of the worlds of metaphor of which they are part. The forms used at Revere were surely adopted as symbols with graspable implications that the 15th century visitor would have understood.³⁰⁹ Alberti understood that appearances - visual information for the viewer to apprehend - were important. The castle of the tyrant was a political statement. He wrote of a castle or a citadel, "... it ought to look fierce, terrible, dangerous and unconquerable".³¹⁰ The palace at Revere was not such an awesome spectacle, but the towers and crenellations may well have been a public statement by Lodovico to the effect that he possessed, in the symbols, the strength and power that were proper to the prince.³¹¹

As these details were fitting so also they commended themselves to the taste of the time. But because the objects' meaning was symbolical, taste was not formal. Rather, it was in the allusive significance. The crenellations of that type were used too frequently in the earlier part of the 15th century for them to have had a classical connotation, and they were surely too elaborate to have been capable of harmonizing modestly - mutely - with the classical elements of the building. They may have been a personal indulgence of the imagination as has been suggested was

the case with the classicizing details of the building.

The towers and crenellations do give a certain courtliness to the palace, as well as some illusion of strength and security. And there is evidence that in the visual artistic ambience of Mantua, before the building of the palace at Revere, courtly values were deliberately followed. These values were not completely supplanted at Revere, but survived residually in the towers and crenellations. Crenellations also run round the courtyard walls and make clear that they were part of a fortified garb that was not out of place in secure and 'civilised' areas. As originally planned during Lodovico's time, the palace made provision for the genteel life. In the terms of the chivalric ideal, the virtues of strength and aggression are harmonized with gentleness and refinement of manners. (The later bucolic ideal harmonized a secure but not aggressive strength with a similar refinement). The symbols of strength and the symbols of courtliness for a knight are not clearly distinguished.

In the Sala del Pisanello, at Mantua, a group of ladies sit in a grandstand erected outside a city (Fig. 95). One of its buildings, four-towered, with moat, drawbridge and ravelin, resembles the Castel di S. Giorgio. The drawbridge is down and the base of the building is not obscured by hills and trees, but is boldly shown. The ladies' return to the city, and to the castle in particular, will be easy. The fortified building is not antagonistic to the nature of the lives of these ladies. On the contrary, it participates in their elegance and refinement as it sets the scene of their activity and awaits their return. In the palace at Revere, the symbol of

strength - the crenellation - decorating both the exterior and the walls of the courtyard, also tends to add refinement.³¹² Carefully made and decorated with paintings and, over the side entrance on the interior and exterior, probably coats of arms in relief set into recessed panels (Figs. 96, 97), they would have had a richness similar to Pisanello's city-scapes.

It is in the light of allusion to the values of chivalry that the mock-fortifications of the palace may be understood. There, surely not coincidentally, strength is decorative both privately and publically - and the want of it, practically, does not invalidate the employment of its symbols. The features continued to be appropriate in some way - perhaps in connection with public function - for they were used in the early 1460s on the Palazzo Vecchio in Mantua (Fig. 98).

However, the building is typologically ambiguous for, as well as possessing the character of a town house.³¹³ In fact, the intention to give the building the aspect of a town house appears to have conflicted with the desire to give it a castellated air.

5. The Palace as Town House.

The large windows give little relief to the north facade. Except on the mezzanine level where the windows have chamfered inner surfaces, the wall on which windows are hung is given no quality of massiveness (Fig. 36). Instead, unrelieved, it has the quality of a tough, stretched membrane. It is by the use of the castellated features - the small counterscarps and the crenellations - that relief is given, and then minimally, for their plasticity is played down. The counterscarps are vestigial and most of the crenellations are and always were filled in.³¹⁴

The north facade seems to have been conceived pictorially - the wall surface being the substrate, enlivened three-dimensionally only at top and bottom. Windows and door have, primarily, a colour value. Secondarily, they are sculptural appliqué. Moreover, it seems to have been conceived frontally, like a linear perspective construction, rather than obliquely. The Palazzo Vecchio and the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi, in Florence, may be viewed satisfactorily on the angle. The machicolations of the one and the cornice of the other contain the rising shapes and, like a tent's guy-ropes, hold down the dynamic vertical edges of the building. The problem did not exist for the Palazzo Rucellai which was primarily a street frontage. It did for the Palazzo Piccolomini at Pienza (Fig. 99) but was not solved. At Revere, masonry buttresses the bases of the towers only on their northern faces, and their flanks are provided with no visual support. The angles of the towers rise straight and uninterrupted to the eaves of the roof - higher than the body of the building and so, with increased

energy and insufficient restraint. Viewed from the north, though, the towers are carefully controlled. They contain the facade, but their effect of buttressing and protecting the curtin from blows delivered from the sides is reduced, on the one hand by the seeming insubstantiality of the wall, and on the other, by the placing of the windows. The windows of the first, second and third storeys deny the existence of the towers lying flush with the curtin.³¹⁵ The strength of the towers' outer edges is reduced by the placing of the windows of the towers towards these edges,³¹⁶ giving the impression, almost, that the facade has been arbitrarily trimmed, and might have extended to left and right to become a street facade where plasticity was not required.

Arranged in vertical and horizontal rows, the windows provide some information about the internal spaces. By its window placement the palace advertizes itself as a building for habitation, and the relative clarity of its horizontal divisions implies a similar clarity in the relation of internal spaces, even though the positions of floor levels are not located in the decoration of the facade. Vertical divisions, because they are not integrated into a simple architectonic framework, give little idea of the sizes of rooms. The opacity of wall surface (the proportion of window to wall area is much less than in Venetian palaces, where the composition is similar) is a feature shared with, say, the piano nobile of the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi, but the facades of mid-15th century Florentine palaces are, relatively, more plastically developed. In this respect, the palace at Revere resembles more closely Roman palaces like the Palazzo Sforza-Cesarini, built

after 1458 by Rodrigo Borgia.³¹⁷ Flatness and opacity are characteristics of brick architecture. The brick is a small module that does not lend itself to the creation of relief in buildings for, like rubble and plaster, it is stockpiled, and is seldom made individually, as a stone may be, for a particular location. Lacking an interesting individuality, it is best reduced to uniformity in a smooth stretch of wall. The brick facade of the palace at Revere is, for the most part, neutral, and substance is given the front by the application of high relief door and lower relief windows. The facade is given what tectonic strength it has by the implication that it is strong enough to support the windows. Their plasticity is, in fact, nicely judged, But solid and void are not sharply distinguished: the difference between wall and window is primarily colouristic. The composure and sobriety of the facade is given it by these details. The values they represent are different from those of the facade considered for its fortified aspect and prevail at the latter's expense. They relate the building with the values of town house building as Alberti understood the art. Alberti considered gravity and dignity to be qualities essential in the town house (IX, 2). He must have believed that he gave them to the Palazzo Rucellai and would not have found the classicizing details of the palace at Revere and their dispositions unsatisfactory in terms of gravity and dignity.

Whilst the towers and crenellations of the palace had quite precise symbolic and typological significance, classicizing details appear not to have had. They appear to have had a purely decorative first purpose, at this stage, and to have been without

any functional or pseudo-functional implications. In Filarete's treatise, Lodovico's speech recounting his conversion to the ancient style³¹⁸ tends to confirm that view. The impression given is that Lodovico adopted it as a fashion. It was primarily as visual data that the ancient style recommended itself, not as interpretable material that would give specific information about its user (except insofar as works were rich and expensive). The employment of classicizing forms would have been without obvious rhetoric at the time and so the building, to the extent that it was a personal indulgence, was a private building.

6. The Palace as Country House.

Neither entirely a castle nor, because of its location as well as its typological and stylistic links with castles, a town house, the palace, despite the facts that it was associated with a small town and an extensive castle, and the bucolic delights that Pius II so much enjoyed³¹⁹ were handy, is not, strictly speaking, a country house either.³²⁰ Of its residential purposes, one was as a summer house according to Sissa.³²¹ Several documents show that it was used as a guest house (e. g. Docs. 177, 200).

However, in some respects, the palace may be regarded as a country house. And that it was regarded as such is suggested by the choice of some of its interior decoration.³²² As a combination of some of the qualities of a town house and some of those of a castle-palace in contact with the country, it may represent one of what was, for Alberti, that other "... sort of private houses, in which the dignity of the town house and the delights and pleasures of the country-house are both required... These are the pleasure houses just without the town, or the villas".³²³ The Medici villa at Careggi possessed the same virtues for Galeazzo Maria Sforza, who described it in a letter of 23rd April, 1459, to his father. After praising the gardens, he expressed his approval of the house, and concluded that its provisions were no less than those of a house in the city.³²⁴ Filarete made the same point: "Outside the city there are also palaces (of the Medici) and other most noble buildings that would be excellent ornaments for any city, for example the one at Careggi".³²⁵ If an air of dignity was required of a country house

in the country for it to merit the name villa, the palace at Revere has something of that merit.

The villa was not a simple type of building at this time. It could possess the dignity of the town house, and Hatfield remarked that town houses themselves acquired an air of dignity partly by appropriating motifs - like heavy rustication and two-light windows - that properly belonged to secular public buildings.³²⁶ Villas like Trebbio and Caffaggiolo were built "a guisa di fortezza".³²⁷ Writing of Caffaggiolo, Vasari referred to garden features that were apparently not inappropriate to a castle, insofar as it was one.³²⁸ The dignified, but fortified, villa at Careggi was seen by Carocci as a castle against Cosimo de' Medici's enemies.³²⁹ Characteristics of castle and town house were not out of place in the villa, but, rather, their strength and refinement seem, in part, to have constituted it.

In the 15th century, the word villa was not entirely satisfactory, because it still suggested a rustic dwelling and farm, and could not describe the more noble buildings that were country residences. Leonardo, one of the interlocutors in Della Famiglia, really understands by villa the farmstead - a means of self-sufficiency. The fecundity of nature is a generous response to good husbandry.³³⁰ However, the country house was also a retreat. In this connection, the palace at Revere is again ambiguous. It could make such provision. But, though manorial vis-à-vis the agrarian economy of the region, it was also involved with commerce, administration and defence, vis-à-vis the castle, the region and the territory. In these respects, its functions were

public.

Gianozzo, again in Della Famiglia, sought words to describe the villa: "... tu non desiderresti cosa più niuna; posti in aere cristallina, in paese lieto per tutto bello occhio, rarissime nebbie, non cattivi venti, buone acque, sano e puro ogni cosa". These were "palagi di Signori, e più tengono forma di castella che di ville".³³¹ The Medici villas were such buildings. And the palace at Revere, though it could not, perhaps, claim the same geographical - or meteorological - advantages, had a form that would entitle it to the same name.

On the one hand, the palace at Revere, within a ring of outer defences, could afford to give itself the air of refinement that belongs to the town house. On the other hand, the symbols of aggressive strength - the towers and crenellations - were already compounded with refinement in the terms of the chivalric story. The palace combined the town house's dignity with a castle's strength that was already somewhat emasculated and suggested refinement. When strength could be given to such a building without the employment of symbols of strength, a dignity of a less aristocratic and imaginative kind could exist and find expression in the villa. In the meantime, the palace at Revere was a country house insofar as it had characteristics of town houses and castles.

The relation of the palace to the countryside as it was understood in the 15th century may be inferred from a letter of 28th January, 1460 (Doc. 223), recounting Cardinal Roteno's favourable impression of Revere and the surrounding territory. He

described the palace as superbo and apto. The first word, associated with ideas of aristocratic pride, could not be used in a discussion of agrarian economy, but apto is a word whose meaning is not far from one that would provide "molte abundantia di varie cose al viver del homo ..." ³³² So, from the use of the word superbo, it is evident that the palace was not seen as a mise en scène for bucolic delights except, perhaps, accidentally, insofar as "palagi di Signori ... più tengono forma di castella che di ville". It was, as an element in the countryside, not in conflict with it. There was a rapport. The glories of the one overlapped with those of the other - both being 'legible' in terms of notions of plenty, wealth and an unfretsome way of life. The palace at Revere was not 'read' as the stronghold of a baronial tyrant.

Summary

When it came to raising walls and enclosing interior spaces of the palace, the north wing seems to have received attention first. The period of the carving of the stone-carved window frames indicates approximately when the north facade was built. From about 1454 to 1458, the north wing and part, at least, of the side wings were built up to their present height. The process of finishing apartments continued as the structure rose. Little work seems to have been done after 1458. Perhaps at this time, the east wing was left half-complete. The fourth wing was never added.

The relationship of the form of the palace to specific function is difficult to establish, for the palace and the castle that contained it served a multitude of functions. In any case, form in buildings may often be merely decorative and symbolic with regard to function.

It has seemed appropriate to discuss three possible typological identifications of the palace. As a rectilinearly planned, towered and castellated building, it resembles the castle-palaces of the Visconti and the castles of Mantua and Ferrara designed by Bartolino da Novara. Public and private functions combine here in allusions to martial pride and chivalric refinement. The use of the all'antica style encourages the identification of the palace as a town house. Indeed, the palace was the centre of an urban complex, albeit a small one. But here too, private and public functions combine, for the all'antica style at the early time of the 1450s does not seem to have had precise and readily

legible typological implications when applied to domestic buildings. Use of the style was an exercise of almost private taste on the part of the patron. The third identification, as country house, is suggested by the function of the palace as the signorial centre of an agricultural region. As such a centre, it was manorial. It is possible, too, that the palace served as a retreat from the city of Mantua. Also, since country palaces were described by contemporaries as combinations of castles and city palaces, it is appropriate to consider the palace at Revere under this heading.

Architectural expression of practical function and what could be called artistic purposes combined in the palace as it equivocated between its public and private roles. Whether Lodovico resolved the stylistic ambivalence of Revere in the other palaces that he built later is not known, for it is the only substantial palace that survives in the territory. However, it seems likely that his commitment to the all'antica style eventually enabled him to give to other buildings a less ambiguous typological character - especially since familiarity breeds compliance with novelty. Nevertheless, the palace at Revere did display a combination of local and Tuscan stylistic features that, for a while, had an influence on building in Mantua and the territory.

VI Other Buildings in Mantua and the Territory. Lodovico's
Government of Building.

1. "Fancellian" Buildings in Mantua and the Territory

A number of buildings in the Mantovano and in Mantua itself have been associated with the palace at Revere and have been attributed to Luca Fancelli.³³³ As regards country houses, Marani attributes to Fancelli "La Ghirardina" at Motteggiana and the Palazzo Secco, or Pastore, at S. Martino Gusnago.³³⁴ Carpeggiani,³³⁵ Campagnari,³³⁶ and dal Prato³³⁷ follow Marani's attributions. The basis of the attributions is the appearance, in those buildings, of one or more features found in the palace at Revere. These features are of a decorative nature. They are not aspects of general planning, for neither "La Ghirardina" nor the Palazzo Secco resembles Revere in planning and grouping of parts.

The palace at Revere consists of three wings set round three sides of a rectangular courtyard. There are two angle towers at the north. The visitor passes through a barrel-vaulted androne in the north wing, and emerges in the deep vaulted space of the north loggia. Arcades and covered areas of lesser depth run down the sides of the courtyard. Above the north loggia are habitable spaces on two levels. Above the side porticos are corridors, also on two levels. The visitor to "La Ghirardina" (Figs. 100-103) ascends a flight of steps through the long androne, passing through the two-storeyed south-west wing. (Marani observed that the long androne was a common feature of

Mantuan domestic architecture of the period).³³⁸ He emerges upon a 'hanging' courtyard, three sides of which are bounded by wings of one storey on that level. Opposite the androne and occupying most of the length of the two-storeyed north-east wing is the portico, three bays long and two bays deep. A doorway at the back of the portico gives onto a flight of steps descending to the garden. Access to the apartments of the high north-east wing is through a door in the east side wall of the portico. With this arrangement, provisions are made expressively for the various functions of the building. Storage space is provided on the vaulted ground level. At the level of the hanging courtyard are public and private rooms. The signorial apartments occupy the high north wing.³³⁹ The Palazzo Secco is a simple, block-like structure. The principal front entrance gives onto a flight of steps leading up to the first floor level (Fig. 104).

The three buildings do share some decorative features. In all three, the same type of crenellation, filled in for the greater part, appears. At "La Ghirardina", there is a courtyard loggia of clearly Tuscan inspiration (Fig. 58). With classicizing columns and capitals, and with a covered area of two by three bays, it is vaulted in the same manner as at Revere. Two terracotta framed windows, of the type introduced by Fancelli at Revere, survive in the building (Fig. 105). The Palazzo Secco shares with the palace at Revere a grouping of windows, as opposed to a uniform placing. And, alluding to a Tuscan ambience providing inspiration for the designer, is a dentil course running the length of the facade, like on the Palazzo Medici in Florence.

All the authorities mentioned above date the buildings to shortly after the middle of the 15th century³⁴⁰ -to the time, in fact, when the palace at Revere could have served as a model. Indeed, it is not possible to argue plausibly that those buildings served as models for Revere. The windows at "La Ghirardina" derive from Revere's. That window type did not perfect itself by a process of evolution within artisan tradition. Rather, it could become decadent. A comparison of the window found at Revere (Fig. 74) and that at Motteggiana reveals the inferiority of the latter, whose designer adopted the elements, but treated them decoratively rather than plastically. At S. Martino Gusnago, the dentil course on the facade should probably be seen as a refinement of horizontal articulation, compared with Revere.

It has been shown that the palace at Revere did not have a single designer. Besides the building of the old machicolated towers, there were three more or less distinct planning intentions. One was the building of the structures that now constitute the lower side wings. The next was the building of the north wing and the raising of the whole palace to its present height. This set of proposals probably included the intention to build arcaded courtyard loggie. The third plan concerned the present courtyard arrangement and the provision of the spaces above. There is also reason to believe that the application of castellated features and of classicizing stone-carved details to the building were not the responsibility of one artist. The relationship suggested, then, between Revere and the palaces at Motteggiana and S. Martino Gusnago becomes tenuous, especially as what similarities there

are, are of a decorative nature, and are of both a castellated kind and a classicizing kind.

Moreover, the appearance in Gonzaga correspondence of the name of Antonio Manetti and the likelihood that he was involved with design work at Revere, taken together with the absence of evidence that Fancelli worked on anything other than the carving and installation of stonework, complicate further the question of attribution of "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco. It is not so much the involvement of Fancelli with these and other projects that is in doubt as the nature and extent of his involvement. The Tuscan intervention or interventions at Revere produced the courtyard design together with the interior spaces that it permits to exist and the stone-carved details. But there is reason to believe that they remained separable, during the period of planning and construction, from the castellated aspect of the building. In other words, though crenellations and towers, considered generically, would not necessarily have been eschewed by a Tuscan architect who was sympathetic towards the kind of buildings created at Trebbio and Caffaggiolo, there is nothing particularly and fundamentally Fancellian or Manettian about the juxtaposition of classicizing and castellated features at Revere. The design work of Manetti and the decorative work of Fancelli did not probably extend to the provision of the fortified aspect. In that particular form, the crenellations are, more likely, the contribution of local brick-laying expertise.³⁴¹ Crenellations at "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco are, alone, insufficient to suggest that they share authorship with the palace at Revere. Their combination

with classicizing features could be the work of someone who found them at Revere but was not, initially, responsible for their presence there.

Moreover, it may be that the relationship of planning to execution at Revere does not parallel that at "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco. While Fancelli was more or less continuously involved with the palace at Revere during the 1450s, Manetti was not, and it is possible to separate decorative work from planning. As far as Fancelli is concerned, Revere may be said to constitute part of his early education but not to represent his own early architectural practice. The plans for "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco were probably more comprehensive than those produced by Manetti for Revere. And direction of the execution of the buildings was not probably a shared responsibility, as it seems to have been at Revere.

When the palace at Revere is seen not to represent one man's conception, the presence of features possessed by it in the Palazzo Secco and "La Ghirardina" complicates the problem of attribution. Questionable, for example, is the argument from the fact that the two country houses share with Revere a transitional character. The cases are probably not strictly parallel. Campagnari wrote of the common factor, in "...qual carattere di transizione fra il Gotico e Rinascimento..."³⁴² But that characteristic of the palace at Revere was probably the accidental consequence of a number of artists working more or less independently, rather than a deliberate attempt, at artisan level, to marry two traditions. If a marriage was attempted at Revere, the

intention would, more likely, have originated with the patron than at the level of the architect.

Do "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco represent a deliberate fusion of traditions (in the case of the Palazzo Secco, minimally, for the classicizing element is not strong)? Or did the buildings reach their present forms as a result of the efforts of a number of independent artists, as at Revere? Both buildings need to be studied in greater detail for the history of their construction to be understood and for those questions to be answered confidently.³⁴³ However, it does seem to be possible to discern a very rudimentary history for "La Ghirardina". Campagnari's drawings (Figs. 100, 101) suggest that the vaulted ground floor structures - some of which are more heavily constructed than the upper parts require - belonged in part to an earlier, perhaps fortified, building. For example, some of the walls of the north-east wing are especially thick. Then, walls seem to have been built in pre-existing ground floor spaces to support walls above. That would be the case for the left wall of the courtyard loggia and for the square room at the north-west corner of the building. On the plan of the ground floor the lines of the groins of the vaults are cut by walls in these areas.³⁴⁴ The presence of bevel-recessed windows on the ground floor level - distinguishable from the fenestration on higher levels - tends to support the suggestion that the building, in its lower reaches, was standing before the middle of the 15th century. An extension has been added to the south-west wing.³⁴⁵ However, despite some irregularities in fenestration that are perhaps the result of later

modifications, the whole building, above ground floor level, has a certain coherence in the grouping of parts. That coherence in general design implies a unity of conception and suggests that a single building campaign raised it from first floor level.³⁴⁶

However, while the building may have a unity of conception, it does not show a uniformity in execution. The style of some of its features may be associated readily with Fancelli. But others may not. For example, the capitals of the columns of the portico (Fig. 106) may be associated in style and execution with the corbel capitals of the north portico of the palace at Revere. The terracotta window frames, however, are of timorous execution and generally possess a meagre plasticity (Fig. 105). They contrast with the windows at Revere (Fig. 74), and are clearly derivative. The cornice element lacks the quarter-circular convex moulding above the dentil course. The dentils themselves are many and small. Fancelli, for his part, may be expected to have designed a more robust window frame. Moreover, the installation of the portico seems hesitant and indecisive - suggesting that it was not planned very rigorously (Figs. 58 & 102). Four whole columns are used to support the arches, where two columns and two half-columns would have been more satisfactory (In favour of this arrangement, it is probably true to say, however, that half-columns are more difficult to carve than whole columns). Then, it has been necessary to introduce square impost blocks above the capitals. Whether their purpose is to raise the arches or to increase the area of the arches' springing points is not clear. Perhaps the second is the more likely reason,

for no severe difficulties would have resulted from lowering the arches by a few inches.

There is some doubt, then, that general planning detailed design, and execution are all to be considered the work of one man. The first design conception, in that case, was concerned with the functions and relationships of parts and did not include, necessarily, the specific character of the building as it is created by features of a decorative nature. It is not possible, then, to agree entirely with Carpeggiani when he writes that "La Ghirardina", "...opera...il recupero, razionale, filologico, e critico del castello e del villaggio medioevale insieme".³⁴⁷

While the execution of details and the execution of some of the construction work are mixed in quality, the general planning of the building is ingenious. The planning of the palace at Revere does not anticipate the ingenious and hierarchically expressive solution found in "La Ghirardina". The functions of rural dwelling, store and castle are indicated in a coherent way at Motteggiana.³⁴⁸ Marani sees a discontinuity between decorative features, deriving from Revere, and planning. He writes, "...nonostante tali motivi di parentela con il palazzo di Revere, nel palazzo di Motteggiana la concezione generale é ben diversa e quanto mai originale!"³⁴⁹

While specifically Fancellian features, like the window form and the courtyard columns are, on the one hand, poorly executed and, on the other, unsatisfactorily installed, and while the use of crenellations is to be seen as a generally serviceable procedure rather than the stylistic signature of a particular

builder, is it possible plausibly to attribute the general design to Fancelli? Because the columns and capitals almost certainly emerged from Fancelli's workshop and are not perfectly adapted to their location, it seems unlikely that Fancelli would have produced both the general design and the columns (which, bearing the arms of the Compagnori Giorgi family, were surely carved for their site). Moreover, the solution as a whole at Motteggiana seems to signify a more mature architectural intelligence than would be expected in Fancelli at the time. The conclusion is thoroughly assailable, but it derives some strength from the fact that there is a certain lack of sophistication in the adapting of the courtyard loggia.

However, it is possible that Fancelli was responsible for directing the execution of the work and giving it its stylistic character - directly, in the case of the courtyard portico and indirectly, in the case of the terracotta framed windows and perhaps the crenellations. In favour of the suggestion is the mixture of local and Tuscan forms. It is possible that, rising from first floor (and in parts from ground level) in one building campaign, it deliberately sought a marriage of two traditions. Revere, by contrast, represents a marriage by default of one of the traditions liquidating the other so-to-speak. Whilst the palace at Revere does not have both all'antica and castellated detail in imitation of another local building, "La Ghirardina" has them in imitation of the palace at Revere, which the builder interpreted as a kind of unity. Thus, "La Ghirardina" would be considered a youthful work of someone whose introduction to building and architecture was a work

that was an accidental, in the first instance, rather than an essential, mixture of styles. A miscalculation regarding how columns could best be used for the portico could also be a sign that the builder was yet unfamiliar with such details of building practice.

If such was Fancelli's role at "La Ghirardina", the designer of the general plan is still unknown. Obviously, Manetti's name suggests itself. However, the absence of any stylistic corollary (by definition of the attribution of execution to Fancelli or someone else) with any other work on which Manetti was engaged does not advance the idea beyond conjecture. The portico at Revere, with which Manetti seems to have been concerned, could have served as a model for Motteggiana to someone who studied or worked on it.³⁵⁰

The general design that is conceived by this discussion is separate from detailed design work and execution. As such, it is an almost purely intellectual one, consisting materially of simple drawings and accompanied by no instructions of a specifically stylistic nature. It does seem, however, to have supposed the relatively thin walls of brick construction. And if it included the idea for a portico of the present size, it foresaw three arches - the only feasible number - and therefore the present rather Tuscan proportion of arcuation, recalling that of the Palazzo Medici, for example. It is possible that among the jobs that Manetti did while in the Mantovano was the general design of "La Ghirardina".

However, there is, at present, no basis for a firm attribution. Other buildings that Manetti worked on do not, by their

nature, testify to a similar ingeniousness in the separating and organizing of functions.³⁵¹ It is possible to see in the arrangement of "La Ghirardina" a deliberateness that amounts almost to an architectural polemic, concerned with the precise definition of functions leading to a clear definition in compartition. Of course, Alberti was concerned with such matters. But there is no reason to suppose him unique. Perhaps, in the approach to the planning of Motteggiana, there is a certain intellectualism - a search for new and appropriate architectural order in prior definition of function - not dissimilar from the case of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo in Mantua. But the point is a tenuous one.

The Palazzo Secco may be the work of Fancelli. But the grounds for attribution, though probably sufficient, are not firm. Other names could probably be offered with equal plausibility. The absence of features found at Revere, like the window frames, arches and vaults, does not bolster the stylistic attribution, which is left dependent upon the presence of filled crenellations and groupings of windows (Fig. 104).³⁵² The placing of windows is normally determined by the position of internal walls. Where two windows in one wall light a space, they are usually placed close to the corners of it.³⁵³ Therefore, a short stretch of wall between a couple of windows implies rather an internal separation of two spaces than a single space. Window placement, then, is not so much a stylistic feature as a functional one. Moreover, it is likely that, at Revere, the placing of windows in the north facade was not decided by Fancelli but was dictated by the presence of interior walls over whose location he had no

control. However, in the same way that, at Motteggiana, Fancelli may have adopted a stylistic vocabulary first assembled at Revere, he may, in the Palazzo Secco, have accepted and used crenellations and the method of placing windows. Windows are so grouped in many Mantuan buildings, probably built in the second half of the 15th century, and many of these also have decorative details, like window frames, that derive from Fancelli's example.³⁵⁴ He may have adopted a traditional method of placing windows and have handed it on to later conventional practice. The dentil course that runs the length of the facade of the Palazzo Secco is not absolutely typical of Fancelli's work and a sure sign of his activity. It is one of the elements of the cornice of S. Sebastiano but is not certainly attributable to Fancelli. On the Palazzo Secco, it is, however, a classicizing feature, and it may have been Fancelli, Lodovico's expert on all'antica detail in the 1450s, who satisfied Francesco Secco, Caterina Gonzaga's husband, by providing it. Nevertheless, it may be said that it is no very considerable display of expertise.

The influence of the palace at Revere and the activity or influence of Fancelli is identified by Marani in a number of buildings in Mantua itself.³⁵⁵ Two salient features of the palace are used for purposes of identification. They are the filled crenellations and the window frames rendered in terracotta. The window frame should indeed be associated with Fancelli. There can be little doubt that its first appearance in the Mantovano was at Revere, where he was responsible for its introduction. One of its earliest appearances was in the Casa di Giovan Boniforte

(Fig. 107), built, according to inscriptions on the cross-lintels of its portico, in 1455.³⁵⁶ Fancelli may have been involved with this unusual and exotic building. The top right hand window of the facade is without its lintel band. Instead, the window is topped by a cornice element like that used at Revere. Another window, high on the right flank of the house, has flat jamb and lintel fascie contained by mouldings identical with those round the windows of the facade. On top is the same cornice element (Fig. 108).

One of the capitals of the portico of Boniforte's house is Corinthian (Fig. 46), and derives from the Brunelleschian type discussed by Saalman.³⁵⁷ In fact, the capital at Mantua resembles rather closely a pair of the capitals of the north-east exedra of S. Maria del Fiore (pair 3, aedicule 1). Triple sickle-nicking is to be seen under the drilling between the ends of the leaves at Mantua. There is double-nicking in Florence (Fig. 109). Also similar is the manner in which the lower, outer parts of the leaves overlap the edges of the central part. The proportion of width of abacus to diameter above astragal is different - the Florentine volutes rising out of a relatively narrow calathos - the Mantuan capital being rather close-grouped and tubular. Saalman notes the similarity between the Duomo capitals and those of the Pazzi Chapel. In detail, the carving of the volutes of the Pazzi Chapel capital³⁵⁸ resembles Boniforte's. Saalman suggests that the Duomo pair 3 may have belonged to Brunelleschi's period. But if the similarities between the exedra capitals and the Boniforte one are the result of one man providing designs for both, an attribution to Manetti would be plausible, and the Duomo

capitals could be dated to the period when Manetti was capomaestro. If Manetti was involved with the house of Boniforte, it is tempting to associate the window type with him too. However, since the carving of the capital is still probably to be attributed to Fancelli, and it is always possible to argue that similarities between that capital and those of the exedra are not close enough, it is wiser to associate the window type with Fancelli. Even if he did not design it, it seems to have become an element of his architectural manner.

Where the window type appears in later buildings, however, Fancelli's direct involvement is not an inescapable conclusion. Such windows could derive from his example independently of his activity. There is considerable variation in proportion and detail (Figs. 110, 111). Perhaps a greater uniformity would be expected if Fancelli always arranged for their manufacture at the brick furnace.

Since the crenellation form used at Revere depends on and derives from the skill of the bricklayer, and there is no reason to suppose that Fancelli chose it at Revere - where he seems to have been employed only to carve and install stonework - it should be considered as a feature of local building practice rather than as a pointer to individual inspiration. However, its frequent appearance in town houses that seem to be of later date than Revere³⁵⁹ and their questionable appropriateness in such a location may point to a direct initial influence. If the crenellations in town houses were purely decorative features and were devoid of defensive purpose, just such an interpretation of the purpose of

those used at Revere would have justified their expropriation. As a stylistic motif that had usurped the purpose of a functional device, the crenellation could readily be adapted to a designer's vocabulary, as opposed to constitute an artisan's independent activity. At Revere, crenellations were decorated with heraldic devices.³⁶⁰ The importance of the 'cavalleresque spirit' in Mantuan culture would tend to be confirmed and be seen to percolate down from the princely class. Nevertheless, while the use of the crenellation and the window frame are probably to be associated with Fancelli in some or even in many cases, they are not signs in themselves of his certain involvement with a project.³⁶¹ Confirmation of his involvement must come from other considerations and investigations. The Mantuan building trade had a large manpower.

When the palace at Revere ceases to be seen as Fancelli's work, except in detail, his character as an independent architect, especially early on, becomes vague and problematic. The palace could be said to represent an educative stylistic formula. But it was one of many buildings with which, even as a young man, he would have been familiar. While, as a whole, the palace cannot be said to represent his specific architectural taste and purpose, equally it cannot be said, with any degree of plausibility, to enjoy the status of his exclusive inspiration. Of course, it is possible to suggest that Fancelli found in the palace a 'genial' meeting of Lombardy and the all'antica style, and continued to pay service to it for a while. But then, any of his contemporaries with some expertise in building might have found and done the same thing.

The problems of attribution are exemplified by the case of Palazzo Vecchio, or del Broletto, in Mantua (Fig. 98). Windows of the type under discussion and filled crenellations were built as part of a programme to reorganize into the present building a number of separate structures of the palace in 1461/2.³⁶² The work was carried out by a carpenter and engineer who had worked at Revere, Gian Antonio da Rezo.³⁶³ Fancelli was involved with work on the palace on 12th August 1462, when he was about to have decoration applied to the crenellations (Doc. 231). It is not clear whether Fancelli was the responsible architect, or Gian Antonio provided designs that adapted decorative features of the palace at Revere to the city palace.³⁶⁴ Even here, it is possible that Fancelli was responsible only for decorative work and arranging the supply of brick components of window frames.

Individual features and their combination at Revere may have made the building a potent stylistic influence for a while in Mantua and the territory.³⁶⁵ However, insofar as it is possible to tell, the palace does not appear to have served as an example of general planning.³⁶⁶ Particular characteristics of the palace would tend to preclude the likelihood. On the one hand, the presence in the structure of older remains, as in the east and west wings, suggests that, in those parts and insofar as those parts determined the general outline, it received its form from traditional building practice.³⁶⁷ On the other hand, the denial of the informal arrangement of the bevel-recessed windows in those parts by the more formal system of fenestration, and the clearly improvised nature of the courtyard, show that particular

solutions were produced to meet particular problems. As a unique solution, therefore, the palace did not offer universally applicable formal and functional solutions. If it served as an indicator of what sort of provisions could be made in palaces, the nature of its influence in this general sense is unknown, while a detailed structural and historical survey of Mantuan domestic buildings is wanting.

That, in 1462, crenellations and windows of the type employed at Revere should have been used in the Palazzo Vecchio in Mantua is indicative of the degree of Mantuan attachment to the forms. However, it is unlikely that Revere continued for long to be directly inspirational. Little building work seems to have been done on the palace after about 1459, if the number of surviving documents is anything to go by. Lodovico turned his attention to other palaces. Since the palace at Revere was left unfinished, it seems reasonable to suppose that other sites offered the possibility of making some kind of architectural advance. Such advance need not, of course, have excluded the motifs used at Revere. But if they survived for town houses, secondary sources would more likely, or in most cases, have served as models. The destruction of country palaces built after Revere makes it impossible to identify later influences coming from the Mantovano to Mantua itself.

Marani's description of the phases of Fancelli's career as an Architect in Mantua tends to support the point. The palace at Revere constitutes the entire basis of what Marani sees as Fancelli's early style. A shift away from that style is the

replacement of the influence of the palace on Mantuan architecture by something else or the ideas of someone else. After the group of buildings whose characteristic features are filled crenellations and window frames deriving from the Revere example and/or grouping of windows, Marani identifies a group of later buildings. He associated them with Fancelli and sees in them the influence of Alberti and Mantegna. The impact of local castellated forms is reduced, and the 'ductile' Fancelli produces buildings with a more thoroughly classicizing character. Marani finds this character in the Torre del Orologio in the Piazza del Mercato and in two houses, via Frattini n. 5 and via Franchetti n. 11.³⁶⁸

The attic storeys of both the houses are enriched with classical orders. In via Frattini, pairs of spiral-fluted half-columns and, in via Franchetti, pairs of stubby fluted pilasters alternate, in the one case, with niches and, in the second case, with round-arched openings, the arrangement roughly resembling the facade of S. Andrea. Typical of the late style that Marani attributes to Fancelli are the 'casa-bottega', Piazza Marconi n. 13 and 14, and the tower of the Palazzo Arrivabene (bearing an inscribed plaque with the date 1481) (Figs. 112, 113). There, windows rest on decorative courses and the elements of entablatures with round attic windows opened in the friezes appear below the eaves.³⁶⁹

The stylistic phases of Mantuan house building that Marani identifies and by which he traces Fancelli's development are here sufficient to show that other models or more independent inspiration replaced the palace at Revere.

2. The Ospedale di S. Leonardo.

Besides the palace at Revere, another important building begun by Lodovico at the beginning of the 1450s was the Ospedale di S. Leonardo in Mantua. Again, Fancelli's name has been associated with the work.³⁷⁰

Schivenoglia wrote that the hospital was begun in 1450.³⁷¹ The building was under construction over a long period. In 1466, Schivenoglia recalled, "...el veschovo Galiazo di chaurianj ... cominzoe a fare depinzere per questo ospedallo li soy army..."³⁷² Not until 1472 did the hospital begin to admit patients.³⁷³

The Ospedale di S. Leonardo was only one of several hospitals being planned and built around 1450. At Brescia, it was decided to build the Ospedale di S. Luca in 1427. But only in 1447 was the foundation stone laid. The building was substantially completed in 1450, and the first patients were admitted in 1452. In 1448, a group of citizens of Pavia decided to build a hospital. The foundation stone of the Ospedale di S. Matteo was laid in June 1449. The hospital was opened to patients in 1456. It was first proposed to build the hospital of S. Maria della Pietà in Cremona in 1450. The proposal was supported by a general assembly and Francesco Sforza in 1451. As early as 1448, a re-organisation of hospitals in Milan was approved. However, matters proceeded rather slowly. In May 1451, the Pope approved proposals to build a new hospital near the Laghetto. But nothing seems to have been done, for permission was renewed in May 1456 and regular payments to Filarete began in February 1457. The foundation stone was laid in April of that year.³⁷⁴

Here, it is not possible to clarify the issue of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, and in particular the matter of its authorship. Unfortunately, the scarcity of information about this building and others with which it may be related, and the tortuous paths of hypothesis onto which this limited information leads, hamper attempts at providing a firm attribution. The building now serves as barracks for the Carabinieri. It is not possible to enter, and information about the structure is provided by Marani's descriptions and photographs, and the plan reproduced by Carpeggiani (Fig. 114). Any description given here would inevitably be rudimentary. The plan shows a square building. Apartments occupy all four wings. Superimposed on the square is a Greek cross with one truncated arm. Three of the arms pass beyond the perimeter of the square. Apparently, the cross-arms contained long wards. At the centre of the Greek cross is an octagonal, almost square, space. Its walls are thicker than elsewhere in the building: it may have been intended to be covered in a different manner from the rest of the building, or it may have been intended to be taller. Between the arms of the cross and the square of four wings are cloisters. In the northern one, only one arcade seems to have been built. The other three cloisters are arcaded on the ground floor and are trabeated on the upper level (e.g. Fig. 115).

The two cloisters next to the Piazza Virgiliana (at the top of the photograph), and especially the south-east one, seem to be the parts of the building that were completed first (Fig. 114).³⁷⁵ (However, symmetries in the placing of internal walls in all parts

of the ground-plan tend to indicate that the whole building was laid out in plan at a very early stage). In the first, south-east cloister, corbel capitals are found on both levels.³⁷⁶ Two columns with Ionic capitals are used on the lower level (Fig. 59), but elsewhere, piers support the arches (Fig. 115). The piers are slightly battered, like the profiles of counterscarps. No capitals intervene between arches and piers, and Marani writes that the piers do not appear to hide columns inside.³⁷⁷ Being battered, the supports represent wall and the openings discontinuation of wall. In this respect, the omission of capitals does not resemble the solution in the Cappella dell'Incoronata in Mantua and the side chapels of the Badia at Fiesole, where grey arches represent structure as opposed to wall. However, the use of extrados mouldings in the hospital is inconsistent with the use of piers. The archivolts need to spring from an abacus if piers are not to have a notional fissure down their length. Small columns on high plinths are used on the upper level to support the trabeation of the eaves of the roofs. The capitals could be described as Composite without decoration. On top of the fluted calathos is the moulding which, in decorated capitals, would have been carved with egg-and-dart, and at four points of which would have been volutes. The third cloister has Tuscan capitals on the lower level and Ionic ones above. Considered on the basis of style, it probably dates to the 16th century.³⁷⁸ As has been said, the fourth cloister is incomplete.

The Ospedale di S. Leonardo has been discussed by Marani in connection with the palace at Revere. Now, however, it

is important to note that if the stylistic character of the palace at Revere as a whole and the Tuscan component of design represented by the courtyard are not the responsibility of Fancelli, the stylistic argument for his involvement with "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco is weakened. And the same applies to the Ospedale di S. Leonardo. It should be recognised that, within the limitations of present stylistic understanding, stylistic description does not lead to attribution - not if the palace at Revere is to be the touchstone of attribution and style. Moreover, as will be seen, the hospital resembles Revere only in the general sense that classicizing features appear in both buildings. It is not yet possible to reconstruct in sufficient detail the artistic personalities of those who worked at Revere.

Marani's argument for Fancelli's activity on the hospital rests mainly on the fact of his availability. If the probability of Manetti's activity at Revere obscures Fancelli's character as a young architect by depriving him of responsibility for the mid-fifteenth century design work at the palace, it also raises doubts, as has been seen, about the correctness, or at least justification, of the attribution to Fancelli of works possessing Tuscan characteristics. In the case of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, circumstantial evidence that had favoured an attribution of design work and execution to the available Fancelli (though, as in the case of the palace at Revere, at the expense of consideration of his youth), finds, in Manetti, a more mature, and acceptable candidate, at least for design work. The relatively small scope of Manetti's intervention at Revere may suggest that another, more

important job was the prime reason for him coming up from Florence.

The argument from availability could be applied to Manetti. It is supported by an approximate coincidence of dates. In September 1448, Lodovico Gonzaga was involved with negotiations to have Manetti's services (Doc. 56). It is possible that he was already thinking about a new hospital, for, as early as 8th March 1449, the legal and bureaucratic part of preparations for the start of work had advanced to the point where the Pope had given permission for the building.³⁷⁹ Manetti was present in Mantua in October 1450 (Doc. 76). It was at that time that he was called to Revere.

As far as hospitals were concerned, there seems to have been no necessary order of events - planning and receiving papal permission to build. In the case of the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan, questions of architectural design were considered both before and after the Pope gave permission to build.³⁸⁰ At Pavia, the foundation stone was laid in June 1449, three months before the Pope gave permission.³⁸¹

Does the proposition that Manetti was involved with the Ospedale di S. Leonardo find circumstantial support in connection with hospital building elsewhere in Italy at the time? If Manetti did provide designs for the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, he would have enjoyed a certain elevated status, among other Florentines who may have been concerned with the design of hospitals. Design of such buildings may have called for a certain expertise. Giovanni de'Medici's letter to Francesco Sforza of 28th June 1456, where he

suggested that the opinion of other Florentines be had regarding the design of the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan, may imply that there was need for special expertise.³⁸² Even if it was not a very specialised form of building, architects with practical experience were surely worth consulting. Filarete's description, in the Trattati, of the hospital is elaborate and, proudly, it seems, gives account of sophisticated sanitary provisions built into the structure.³⁸³ Manetti could have possessed practical expertise, either before the call to Mantua, so justifying it, or else, with the benefit of experience in Mantua, afterwards. In either event, he would have distinguished himself, perhaps even uniquely, among contemporaries who had worked on the Ospedale degli Innocenti and S. Maria Nuova.³⁸⁴ The proposition carries with it the possibility - obviously no more - that where unnamed experts are referred to in documents concerning hospital-building, Manetti was one of the experts in question.

However, there is no evidence that Manetti was involved with hospitals in Florence. He worked on several of Brunelleschi's buildings but not, as far as is known, on the Innocenti.³⁸⁵ Similarly, there is no evidence that he worked at S. Maria Nuova. Michelozzo's name is associated with the Ospedale di S. Paolo, in Piazza S. Maria Novella.³⁸⁶

In the event that Manetti produced designs for the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, he provided himself with experience in hospital-design. Might he have been involved in some capacity with proposals for the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan? When Francesco Sforza proposed to build the hospital, he looked to Florence for

architectural advice. Manetti would have been a prime candidate for the work, or at least for advice. However, it is not possible to associate his name with plans, and the Ospedale Maggiore provides no support for the suggestion that Manetti worked on the Ospedale di S. Leonardo.

On 27th April 1451, Nicodemo Tranchedini da Pontremoli, Milanese ambassador in Florence, wrote to Francesco Sforza, "Cosimo dice ve mandra lo inzegniero per l'ospedale dal lagheto instructo et informato apieno de o(m)ne cosa appartenente ad simile edificio et ali ordeni soy et col disegno de questo. Et grandemente comenda questo vostro laudabile et santo proposito!"³⁸⁷ The wording of the letter seems to imply that an architect had been allocated the work in Milan and had been sent down to Florence.³⁸⁸ The engineer was the recipient rather than the provider of information and instruction. He carried a design, probably of a hospital in Florence ("questo (qui)"?). If, indeed, Francesco had sent the engineer to Florence, he could have sent a Lombard, just as, later, in 1456, he sent Giovanni di Sant'Ambrogio "maestro de mura" in company with Antonio Filarete.³⁸⁹

However, although the timetable would be tight, Manetti could have been the engineer. On 21st March, 1451, he was in Milan with Lodovico Gonzaga. On that day, Barbara of Brandenburg arranged his transport to Mantua (Doc.81). Nevertheless, while it is possible, it is unlikely that Manetti, having been entrusted with work on the hospital in Milan and having produced designs for that in Mantua, made his way thence to Florence, there to be the recipient of instruction and then be sent back to Milan. However,

if this order of events is unlikely, it is not necessary to conclude that he was totally uninvolved with the project. It may be thought unlikely that, only a month before Tranchedini's letter, Francesco Sforza should have neglected any discussion of hospital building with Lodovico, who had recently embarked on his own large project - and especially when a Florentine architect, Manetti, was in his company. The near coincidence of dates - Manetti's presence in Milan and Tranchedini's letter - suggests the possibility that Manetti was involved in discussions of the proposed new hospital. He may also have offered advice about the hospital at Cremona, regarding which preparations were being made at the same time.³⁹⁰

However, the architect of the hospital as it was built was Antonio Filarete. He too could have been the engineer whom Cosimo sent to Milan in April 1451. In 1449, he was in Venice, and in September 1451 was at work on the Castello di Porta Giovia in Milan. Florentines were required by the Venetian authorities to leave the city before 15th June 1451.³⁹¹ If the engineer referred to in Tranchedini's letter was Filarete, he returned to Florence before that date. If, as has been suggested, Sforza sent down an engineer to Florence, and it was Filarete to whom Cosimo referred in the ambassador's letter, Filarete had been in Milan before April 1451.

In the Trattati, Filarete's own account of events surrounding the commission for the Ospedale Maggiore shows that it was given in Milan rather than Florence. However, it is not clear from the Trattati whether Filarete first became involved with the project in 1451 or 1456, when letters again passed between Milan and

Florence on the subject of the hospital. And, in either event, Filarete's account is not strictly accurate. He implied that only he was consulted and that a journey to Florence to study the Ospedale di S. Maria Nuova was unnecessary - indeed, the Florentine hospital was inadequate.³⁹² The texts of the letters tell a different story. A letter of 4th June 1456 to Giovanni de' Medici announced the dispatch of "maestro Antonio da Fiorenza Inzignero et maestro Johanne de Sancto Ambrogio maestro de mura" to study hospitals. Giovanni de' Medici was asked to send back to Milan with Antonio and Giovanni, "... se li fosse qualche buono Inzignero...", another master who would discuss how improvements could be made to S. Maria Nuova.³⁹³ Maestro Antonio was Filarete, for Giovanni de' Medici, in his letter of reply of 25th June, referred to Antonio della Porta - surely the maker of the bronze doors of St. Peters in Rome.³⁹⁴ Giovanni suggested to Francesco Sforza that he have the ideas of a number of masters: "Et perche qui sono de maestrj assai et valentissimi io ho ordinato farne fare piu e diversi modellj ... et queglj mandero alla V.S."³⁹⁵ Spencer writes, "Probably Michelozzo, Antonio Manetti, Bernardo Rossellino and perhaps even Alberti were consulted".³⁹⁶ Filarete, perhaps understandably, gives no notice of other architects being co-opted to consider the design of the hospital. He implied, in fact, that he alone was considered for the work.³⁹⁷ As well as the fact that Filarete kept control of the hospital project in the face of certain opposition from Giovanni de' Medici, the likelihood that Francesco Sforza discussed the matter with Lodovico and Manetti in 1451 (unless Filarete had

no connection with the project in 1451) casts doubt upon the general veracity of Filarete's account, even including perhaps the claim that his design was a quite personal invention.

The Trattati contain no reference to the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, despite the fact that, even if Filarete could have denied that it served as a specific model - there are many differences - it could not but have had a prototypical significance, both organisationally and as a classicizing example of hospital design. Perhaps that significance explains the silence. So, Filarete does not elucidate an association between Manetti and the Mantuan hospital. Nor is circumstantial evidence discernible from a reading between the lines. Filarete was aware of events in the Mantovano.³⁹⁸ He took the opportunity in connection with the palace at Revere to praise the progressive ideas of Lodovico. His silence on the subject of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo - even clearer evidence of Lodovico's progressiveness (though in regard to a sacred building rather than a private one) could be taken as a device whereby he was able to maintain the originality of his own design for the Ospedale Maggiore. Against this point, however, it must be confessed that the Ospedale Maggiore had no rivals in scale and magnificence.

If, as seems likely, Filarete knew that Manetti had done work at Revere - a building especially praiseworthy as an example of a private building adopting the ancient style - he may have been alluding to Manetti in the passage in the Trattati where Lodovico talked of "one of those heard named" as a worker in the ancient style in Florence.³⁹⁹ It is less likely that Lodovico was referring

in the passage to the youthful Fancelli. A list of famous names would have to have been very long to include his. Filarete made no direct mention of Manetti in the Trattati. He had occasion to meet him in March 1460, when Francesco Sforza saw a design for fortifications at Pisa that Manetti had delivered.⁴⁰⁰ Filarete mentioned his predecessor and his successor as capomaestri at the Duomo in Florence.⁴⁰¹ A reason for his silence may have been that he knew, when he was writing the Trattati, that Manetti was dead; he died in late 1460 or early 1461.⁴⁰² Nevertheless, there is something perplexing about the universal unwillingness of 15th and 16th century writers on art to mention Manetti by name. Brunelleschi's biographer, the 'Anonimo Gaddiano' and Vasari are all silent.

There are documentary notices that the hospitals of Brescia, Pavia and Milan all looked to those of either Florence or Siena or both as models.⁴⁰³ However, the hospitals of Florence and Siena must have served as models of very general organization. They could not have been specific models of compartition, for they are flexibly adapted. The rigid geometry of the plans of the hospitals in Milan, Mantua and Pavia - all cruciform - contrasts with the more informal groupings at Siena and S. Maria Nuova in Florence. It may represent the development of an embryonic order. S. Maria Nuova has a cruciform shape with adjuncts. However, Foster refers to the Rustici drawing of the hospital (c. 1448-57) to show that the cross-plan was incomplete when Filarete planned the Ospedale Maggiore - the men's wing not having been built.⁴⁰⁴ The hospital in Siena was impressive, Foster suggests, for the long

ward - the Pellegrinaio. It was perhaps a functional and hygienic advance.⁴⁰⁵ The hospitals in the north of Italy vary between themselves. The hospital at Brescia does not survive, but an engraving of it shows a relatively informal arrangement of parts.⁴⁰⁶ It may have possessed long wards. The hospital at Cremona is T-shaped.

The north Italian hospitals may imitate the Tuscan ones in another respect. The projects of the years around 1450 all seem to have aimed at the rationalisation of existing health and charitable provisions in their towns and, in a single building, provide for various groups - men, women and children. The intention at Brescia was to build a single, large general hospital - "Hospitale unum magnum et generale ..." At Cremona, the purpose was to unify the old provisions.⁴⁰⁷ In 1448, Nicholas V approved a plan to reorganise the hospitals of Milan. And Filarete's description of his plan shows that the Ospedale Maggiore was to cater for different groups in need of health and charitable care.⁴⁰⁸ The rationalisation at Mantua involved the absorption of the functions of the hospitals of S. Tommaso, S. Maria di Porto, S. Barnaba, S. Lucia and others.⁴⁰⁹ The Florentine and Sienese hospitals were also large, and gathered together into one building more than one group of the sick.⁴¹⁰

Among the hospitals built in the late 1440s and 50s, the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan surpassed the others in scale, and, in the elaborateness of its planning, as a celebration of the virtue of the Greek cross plan for such buildings. It continued a development that may be traced from Pavia, which was to be regularly

planned with two-tier cloister loggias in the four angles,⁴¹¹ and from Mantua which is of similar plan. If it had been completed as Filarete described it, the Ospedale Maggiore would have consisted of two regularly cruciform parts separated by a church. The form shared by the hospitals of Milan, Mantua and Pavia - a Greek cross containing wards, with corner cloisters filling out the plan into a square - probably recommended itself on symbolic and rational grounds. The chapel was an important element. Functionally, it was a suitable form, for the four-part division of the plan permitted an isolation of groups of occupants - staff and patients - and expressed the comprehensive nature of the provision that the building made. The provision of cloisters, with the monastic allusions that they carried, was appropriate, because these were not secular buildings but religious ones.⁴¹² In all cases, the pope's permission was required for the suppression of smaller hospitals and the building of the new ones. Of course, four-square planning is also a feature of some north Italian castle-palace building of the period - for example, the castle at Pavia.

The Ospedale di S. Leonardo in Mantua clearly occupies an important place among mid 15th century hospitals. However, little is known about the history of its planning and construction. There is almost total silence on the subject of the hospital in Gonzaga correspondence. The shortage of notices, especially in the Copialettere, suggests that Lodovico did not keep continuous control over the building works. The deputati or operai must have attended to the day-to-day affairs of the site.⁴¹³ And usually they seem to have supplied the site from their own resources,

independently of Lodovico's materials supply system (if 'system' is the appropriate word for what often seems an improvised and flexible means of supply). Had they tapped Lodovico's resources, it would be expected that evidence would be found in the 414
Copialettere. The building work was financed by public donations. The considerable length of time that it took to build the hospital and the fact that it is now unfinished (lacking a fourth cloister) suggest that the fund was not particularly well supported. During Lodovico's period, the building was probably not completed to the point that it is now. As has been said above, the third cloister probably dates to the 16th century. The fact that piers replaced columns on the lower level of the first cloister may also point to need to economise on the number of carved stones. The need to increase the building fund may have been the reason for an edict of 1453 regarding commodity prices, "que nemo excedere possit", being enforceable by a fine of 10 lire, one third of which was to go to the accuser, one third to the judge, and one third to the hospital.⁴¹⁵ Of course, such a measure did not assure a constant income to the fund. The name of one man involved with the building of the hospital is known. He was Giovanni Tomaro (Doc. 209).⁴¹⁶

Iconographically, writes Marani, the Ospedale di S. Leonardo has no need of a Tuscan architect. He sees the building being modelled on the Ospedale di S. Matteo in Pavia. As has been seen, the foundation stone at Pavia was laid in June 1449, and the pope gave permission for building three months later.⁴¹⁷ The lines of the elevation and the sculptural detail of the Mantuan hospital, however, do require the presence of a Tuscan artist.

Marani identifies this artist with Fancelli. Indeed, it is likely that Fancelli produced the carved details of the building. The upper-level capitals of the old cloisters consist of a number of elements and are proportioned in such a way that they conform, generally, with a type found frequently in Mantua. That type may be associated with Fancelli. For example, it is found, elaborated, at Motteggiana. The use of flutes on capitals reappears in the portico of the palace that Marani attributes to Fancelli, between the Piazza Mantegna and the via Goito.

However, it is not clear that Marani is correct when he attributes the establishment of the lines of the cloister elevations to Fancelli. And his interpretation of the relationship between plan and elevation does not take account of a number of perhaps important considerations.

One is the possibility that, because, as has been seen, the hospitals of Brescia and Pavia were required to take account of Tuscan hospitals, and the hospital in Milan did so, Lodovico too was obliged to look to Tuscany. Such an order of events would tend to accord with Filarete's account of Lodovico's conversion to the ancient style: Lodovico had heard that they were building in the ancient style in Florence, and determined to have the services of one of those whom he had heard named.⁴¹⁸ Certainly, the Ospedale degli Innocenti was in the "ancient" style. In any case, would Lodovico have looked to a secondary source in Pavia - a building scarcely begun - when it was possible to go to prime sources? Since the hospital at Pavia was to take account of hospitals in Florence and Siena, it must be assumed that the

building in Pavia and contemporary thinking in Florence about hospital design were in agreement.

Another consideration is the fact that, although the building in Mantua may not have needed a Tuscan architect, Lodovico had one anyway, in Manetti. The coincidence of dates of Manetti's presence in Mantua and the start of work on the hospital, taken together with the fact that it was an important enterprise, if anything, make it difficult to argue that Manetti had no interest in the work. If Manetti was involved, he could be supposed to have occupied himself with general design work, and have taken little or no interest in the details of finishing.

A third point is more complicated. It is suggested by Marani's observation that the old cloisters of the hospital have a Michelozzian character. A difficulty with this view is that, if considered as the creation of Fancelli, that character includes elements that disappear for a while from the buildings that Marani associates with Fancelli's early style. In Fancelli's attributed early works, like "La Ghirardina" and the Palazzo Secco - admittedly secular buildings in which a different rule of decorum applied - local forms appear side by side with all'antica details.

In the cloisters of the hospital, 'architrave' courses run above the apices of the arches and locate floor levels on the elevation. Above is a frieze level on top of which is a cornice course serving as the sill of the parapet. The arrangement resembles the treatment of some courtyards and cloisters in Florence: for example, the Palazzo Vecchio, the Palazzo Medici and the cloister in S. Croce.

As such, it is a developed form. In earlier Florentine architecture and in less deliberately classicizing examples of the period, the horizontality of the interior levels is indicated on the exterior by continuous courses running at the level of the window sills, the precise location of floor levels being unknown. Provided that the elevations of the cloisters of S. Leonardo were established in detail at an early stage of building, it would be necessary to suppose that Fancelli, with a developed understanding of the classical manner, reverted to the inexplicit local treatment of wall in his houses. Even at S. Martino Gusnago, where the dentil course runs the length of the facade and serves as window sill, a classical motif has been used but the developed horizontal articulation of the hospital is neglected. If Fancelli reverted to the inexplicit treatment of elevation after the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, he reverted again later, for the stylistic progress that Marani describes for Fancelli concluded with a horizontal articulation of facades with indications of floor levels. Alternatively, if Fancelli is still to be credited with the old cloister elevations, they should be supposed later works, and be associated with such buildings as the house in the via Marconi (Fig. 112). However, Marani notices the influence of Mantegna and Alberti in works of Fancelli's middle period, whilst he finds an echo of Michelozzo in the hospital. S. Leonardo, then, does not seem to fit with Marani's description of Fancelli's stylistic progress.

The strongest argument in support of an attribution of design work to Manetti is merely from availability. But it is perhaps bolstered by doubts about the extent of Fancelli's respons-

ibility. Manetti's work could have consisted only in establishing the general outlines of the building - fulfilling a role like the one that has been conceived for the general designer of the palace at Motteggiana.

However, the old cloisters of the hospital of S. Leonardo may be described as readily as Manettian as Michelozzian. In other words, stylistic analysis is unable, at present, to distinguish between the work of Manetti and Michelozzo with any accuracy. There is neither a marked nor a persuasive individuality in cloisters whereby the consistent concerns of particular designers may be identified.⁴¹⁹

Manetti has been associated with the building of the canon's cloister of S. Lorenzo in Florence.⁴²⁰ The cloister has two levels, the lower broadly arched and the upper trabeated. Ionic capitals are used on both levels. The arches of the lower level are without extrados mouldings.⁴²¹ The upper floor level is indicated by a moulding running above the arcades. The top of the parapet is marked by a similar moulding. As on the upper level of the garden loggia of the Badia at Fiesole and in the cloister there, impost beams are placed between the upper level columns and the elevation trabeation. In the first cloister of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, the upper level columns support the trabeation directly, but a similar increase in height is achieved, this time by the columns' high plinths. Of course, there may be no similarity of purpose in the use of impost beams in the one case and high plinths in the other. At S. Lorenzo, the device may seek to avoid the implication that, if arches are necessary on the lower

level, trabeation for the same intercolumniation on the upper level is precarious. At any rate, the two cloisters are not totally dissimilar. Nevertheless, it cannot be claimed confidently that the same person designed both.

3. Lodovico and the Work of the Mantuan Building Trade.

It is often difficult to gauge the scale, importance and nature of works carried out by the building trade in the Mantovano at the behest of Lodovico Gonzaga. The State Archive contains very many notices of works, of arrangements for the supply of building materials, and of the movements of craftsmen from place to place - presumably also from job to job. The wording of notices is generally opaque. While a close study of archival documents remains to be undertaken, the general impression is merely of ant-like activity. The features of a general policy of architectural patronage and control - still more the development of such a policy - are unclear. Some works derive importance from the accident of their survival. But many do not survive, and others remain to be identified.

Lodovico employed many important engineers and architects of the period.⁴²² The importance of some is attested by the fact that they came to Mantua from elsewhere, and were not on the permanent staff, so-to-speak. That could be said of Antonio Manetti,⁴²³ Aristotele da Bologna,⁴²⁴ Alberti,⁴²⁵ Luciano Laurana⁴²⁶ and perhaps Antonio di Tuccio Manetti.⁴²⁷ Although Lodovico looked to Florence, in employing Antonio Manetti and Luca Fancelli, he looked elsewhere, in employing Aristotele and Luciano. Barbara of Brandenburg's letter of 5th March 1451, to Lodovico in Milan, on the subject of the windows for the palace at Revere may show that he also looked to Ferrara (Doc. 80). The importance of other masters is attested by the fact that, as Mantuans or Mantuans by adoption, they worked abroad.⁴²⁸

Giovanni da Padova went to Naples⁴²⁹ and Lucca.⁴³⁰ Luca Fancelli went to Milan,⁴³¹ Florence and Naples.⁴³² Giampietro da Figino worked for Borso d'Este.⁴³³ Albertino and Jacopo de'Rasconi di Mantova began facing the second and third levels of the campanile of the cathedral of Ferrara on 26th October 1464.⁴³⁴

Many other members of the building trade are referred to in documents. Others, presumably, were never mentioned in letters. A list of named workers during the period of Lodovico's rule up to about 1460 does not claim to be exhaustive, but will perhaps give some indication of the size of the Mantuan building trade.

Numerous documents are concerned with the brick manufacturing industry. Bricklayers in a brick-making region would be numerous too. A letter to the Vicar of Ostiglia, of 29th July 1450, mentions "M.^{ro} Sigismondo muratore".⁴³⁵ "Jacomo murador" was mentioned on 8th August 1450.⁴³⁶ The daughter of "Donato muratore" died in August 1451.⁴³⁷ In October 1451, "Melchiori de Vitaliana muratore" was required to go to Viadana.⁴³⁸ "Viniano muratori" was mentioned several times in correspondence. The first notice seems to be of 13th April 1452.⁴³⁹ He was also mentioned in a letter to the vicar of Revere of 24th August 1456.⁴⁴⁰ On 26th February 1457, a letter explained that he had lost his tools and the services of his assistants, "Zoanne francescho de la riza" and "Romano de Belinzona" (Doc. 157). On 11th April 1457, "M.^{ro} Petrobono de blasiolis muratori" had announced that he intended to come to Mantua.⁴⁴¹ "Binelmo da Parma muratore"

was near death, having broken a leg while dismantling scaffolding at Revere, on 6th November 1458 (Doc. 211). The services of gangs of Ferrarese bricklayers were acquired in 1451 (Docs. 78, 85, 89).

Stoneworkers' names also appear in documents of the period. The most constant and celebrated carver of architectural detail for Lodovico was Luca Fancelli. During his early years in Mantua, Fancelli seems to have worked exclusively in that capacity, rather than as architect and engineer. Four of his assistants are known by name. They were Sandri di Bartolo, Francesco,⁴⁴² Nicholo and Petro.⁴⁴³ In 1462, Luca acquired another assistant. He was Domenico Veronese who, before then, worked for Lorenzo "tagliapietra" or "scarpellino".⁴⁴⁴ Lorenzo was the carver who was associated with the columns at Revere in 1450 (Doc. 66) and 1458 (Doc. 184). Lorenzo's name appears frequently in correspondence.⁴⁴⁵ It is likely that he was a north Italian craftsman, for he had served Lodovico's father, Gian Francesco, at Marmiolo (Docs. 191, 195). Other north Italian stonecarvers were "Jacomo de Zohanne tayapetra habitante in Verona", mentioned in a letter of 18th April 1450 (Doc. 64). and probably "Antonio tayapreda" (Docs. 63, 83, 95, 100). "M.^{ro} Jacomo da como tayapetra habitante qui in Mantova" was mentioned in a letter to the vicar of Suzzara, in October 1452.⁴⁴⁶ In 1458, Lorenzo "tagliapietra" referred to his nephew, "Jacomo taiapreda". (Docs. 187, 195).

Among woodworkers, there was "Zohanne de le ligna", mentioned in a letter of 20th July 1448 to the vicar of Revere (Doc. 55). "Antonio de Ferrara marangonius" was mentioned in a letter

of October 1455.⁴⁴⁷ On 11th December 1457, Lodovico proposed to Fancelli that he would have made up a demonstration piece of cornice according to the latter's design by "Barnardo marangone" (Doc.170). Fancelli reported to Barbara of Brandenburg, on 8th September 1458, that he had found a master who would construct wooden coffer or cassoni (Doc.202). It is likely that the master to whom he referred was a Florentine, for Luca had just returned to Revere from a trip to Florence via Modena. On 26th October 1463, Lodovico Gonzaga was invited to send down to Revere "Maestro Zohanne da li cofani cum la sua brigata a lavorar qui" (Doc.235). Barbara had sought the advice of Piero di Cosimo de'Medici on the making of coffer or cassoni on 3rd November 1460.⁴⁴⁸ It is more likely that she was interested in cassoni.⁴⁴⁹ But if her enquiry was about coffer, she could have been thinking of ceilings, perhaps like that of the chapel in the Medici palace and distinguishable from the traditional open beam and joist system.

The carpenter mentioned most frequently in correspondence of the 1450s was Giovanni Antonio "marangone". He was also called "da Rezo" and variations of that. Marani suggests that he was related to Guido d'Arezzo, bishop of Mantua in the 14th century.⁴⁵⁰ However, it is more likely that Gian Antonio came from Reggio.

Gian Antonio became an engineer. For example, he was called "Zohanne Antonio da Rezo nostro inzigniero" in a letter of 9th December 1459.⁴⁵¹ Presumably, he ceased to be only an executive craftsman and began to take on planning work. Presumably too, his status was increased with the use of the designation. Luca Fancelli also became an engineer. Andrea di Marcho della Robbia addressed a letter to him on 28th June 1471, "Egregio viri

maestro/Luca ingegnere del Singiore Mess/ Federigo data in Mantova".⁴⁵² Already, in a register of 1470, he was called "capo maestro de fabrica" of S. Andrea.⁴⁵³ An indication of Fancelli's versatility is provided by a letter of 22nd February 1477. He wrote from Mantua to Lodovico, listing works which he had done between 1450 and 1466 and for which he had not received payment. Besides stonecarving, he had worked on the building of S. Sebastiano and the Torre del Orologio. He had also worked "... in opere di ligniame, chome la sala di Giacomo da Crema e la chiesa da Suave e multe altre cose, disegni e modegli..."⁴⁵⁴

Like Gian Antonio da Rezo and Luca Fancelli, Antonio Manetti was a woodworker as well as an engineer and designer. He was first mentioned in Gonzaga correspondence on 18th September 1448 (Doc. 56). The last known mention of him in connection with the Gonzaga is in a copy letter of 17th June 1459, from Lodovico in Mantua to Girardino della Muncia (Doc. 218). (This is neglecting the possibility that it was his model, and not Antonio di Tuccio Manetti's, to which Alberti referred in his letter of October 1470 concerning S. Andrea).⁴⁵⁵

Two rather mysterious pieces of correspondence, of 13th August 1459, concern "maestro Antonio da Fiore(n)za". In the letter of that date to Leonello de Zobollis, he was described as a "maestro da trovare acque". Antonio had disappeared while en route to visit Aristotele da Bologna and another engineer. Leonello was asked to give assistance to the knight who was making the search. The knight carried a letter to Antonio asking that he return to attend to work begun and involving excavations (perhaps a well?) (Docs. 219, 220).

Perhaps it is this same "maestro dalle acque" who was referred to a year later, when Lodovico Gonzaga wrote to Piero de' Medici and thanked him for sending the "maestro da le aque" who had given his opinion of a design. The letter explains that another anonymous master had been in the Mantovano for several months before, and had given unsatisfactory advice.⁴⁵⁶ It is not necessary to identify "maestro Antonio da Fiore(n)za" mentioned in the letters of 13th August, with Manetti who was in the Mantovano in June 1459 (Doc. 218). The name was a common one.

On 26th September 1448, "Magister Agucio ingeniere" was involved in demolition work (Doc. 57). No other reference to him has been found, and his stay in the Mantovano may have been short. On 5th December, 1448, Paola Gonzaga invested an engineer called Francesco Pontevico with a piece of land at S. Martino Gusnago.⁴⁵⁷ Other engineers were mentioned frequently in correspondence and over longer periods.

Petro de Barbante was at work at the monastery of S. Giovanni on 29th July 1449 (Dos. 59, 60). On 15th May 1453, the vicar of Revere awaited his arrival, when he would be employed on the paving of a room to be used for the storage of salt (Doc. 119). On 11th April 1453, Petro had been called from Revere (Doc. 118). Rolandino della Volta, the Factor General, mentioned him in a letter of 8th November 1458.⁴⁵⁸

A copy letter of 21st January 1451 mentions "maestro Cinque".⁴⁵⁹ He was Cinque da Asola.⁴⁶⁰ In August 1451, he was at Belgiosio.⁴⁶¹ In February 1452, he was mentioned in connection with work at Vitaliane.⁴⁶² He was sent to Rulli

"disegnare el lavorerio" on 15th September 1452.⁴⁶³ Bertolotti notes that he was to repair flood damage on 4th May 1456.⁴⁶⁴ On 31st December 1451, Lodovico wrote from Borgoforte to the Factor General, instructing him to find Maestro Cinque and Giampetro.⁴⁶⁵ Lodovico having lost track of a couple of masters, here, perhaps, is an indication of the complexity of the Mantuan building trade.

Giampietro da Figino was engaged on hydraulic works on 9th June 1451 and on 12th July of that year.⁴⁶⁶ On 9th May 1453, he was required to go to Goito.⁴⁶⁷ His name appears quite frequently in Gonzaga correspondence.⁴⁶⁸ As has been seen, he also worked for Borso d'Este. At the beginning of the 1460s, he worked on the church of S. Sebastiano.⁴⁶⁹ Giampietro was dead before 8th March 1461. On that date, Lodovico wrote to Bartolomeo Bonatto in Rome. He was sending a piece of crystal to be worked into a salt cellar by Cristoforo Geremia: "...altra volta havea comenzato a lavorare Zampetro quondam nostro inzignero, ma el venne a morte e non lo possete fornire".⁴⁷⁰

Many letters in the Mantuan State Archive concern the engineer, Giovanni da Padova.⁴⁷¹ His role, in connection with civil engineering and architectural works, often seems to have been an important one.⁴⁷² The first known mention of him is in a letter of 28th September 1455, from Barbara of Brandenburg to Lodovico Gonzaga.⁴⁷³ Marani lists works with which he was involved - primarily as a military engineer. He worked at Canneto sull'Oglio, Goito, Marcara, Viadana, Ceresse, Curtatone, Mariana, Asola, Ostiglia and Revere, as well as on civil projects.⁴⁷⁴ To this list

may be added Castelmantovano. Lodovico wrote to him about work there on 20th March 1457.⁴⁷⁵ On 20th May 1460, Lodovico wrote to him from the baths at Petriolo near Siena, mentioning works at the Seriola and Cavriana, as well as the church of S. Sebastiano.⁴⁷⁶ Among Giovanni's hydraulic works, important ones were the construction of a dam and mole at Governolo, and the cutting of the canal from Goito to Mantua in 1460 and 1461.⁴⁷⁷ As well as in Documents 201 and 216, where Giovanni da Padova is quite clearly named, he may be referred to in Documents 180 and 233.⁴⁷⁸

Bertolotti gave some information about "Innocenzo Ranza ingegnere". His name appears several times in documents in connection with hydraulic works, between 1458 and 1471.⁴⁷⁹

Giovanni Tomaro was called "nostro inzi gniero" in a letter to the vicar of Dosolo, of 5th September 1459.⁴⁸⁰ He was mentioned in a letter of 23rd June 1456 to the Rectors of Verona.⁴⁸¹ His involvement with work on the Ospedale di S. Leonardo is documented in a letter of 9th September 1458⁴⁸² and in one of 19th October of that year (Doc.209). Bertolotti referred to a group of five letters, of November and December 1463, from Giovanni to Lodovico: he was at work at Castelnovo. In March 1464, he informed Lodovico that he was laying the foundations of castle walls at Borgoforte.⁴⁸³

Document 219, of 13th August 1459, contains reference to "maestro Aristotele" (da Bologna). Lodovico had employed him on the task of straightening a leaning tower at the Porta Cerese in Mantua, in March 1459.⁴⁸⁴

A letter of 15th May 1460, from Barbara of Brandenburg

to Lodovico, may contain the name of another engineer. She wrote that Lodovico would find, enclosed with her letter, letters giving account of works done "ala Seriola, a la fossa da la Capana, a la concha et a Sancto Sebastiano".⁴⁸⁵ These letters were by Giovanni da Padua, Zampetro (da Figino) and "Alexandro de le tracte". The first two being engineers, perhaps Alessandro was also.

Of course, as well as designers and executors of works, there were others whose relationship with the building trade was more or less peripheral. It is not always clear if people named in connection with works were involved in an executive or design capacity, or, as deputati, were responsible for the logistical side of the business. Alessandro "de le tracte" could have been overseer of another's work. Similarly, it is not clear in what capacity Gabriele da Crema was present at the dyke-building works at Borgoforte in May 1449.⁴⁸⁶ On 14th July 1450, he was required to send his horses or cavalry to Borgoforte (Doc. 70). He was almost certainly the man who had been a pupil of Vittorino da Feltre and who travelled to Rome in 1458 to invite Pius II to convene the council at Mantua.⁴⁸⁷ However, such men as he became Lodovico's vicars: it was another pupil of Vittorino, Lodovico della Torre⁴⁸⁸ who, as vicar of Revere, was obliged to concern himself with the state of the fabric of the castle (Doc. 238). Vicars like Gian Marco da Rodiano took a direct interest in building work (e. g. Doc. 204). Men of the same education as Lodovico Gonzaga may have been able to take as active an interest in architecture and engineering. Johanne da Crema was at

Pontemolino in connection with building works on 21st February 1451 and 22nd March 1451.⁴⁸⁹ He carried money to the bricklayers at Revere in July 1448 (Doc. 55). The precise nature of the activity of Ghisulfo de Ghisulfis is also unknown. He was occupied with works of fortification at Pontemolino and Torre di Mezzo, north of Ostiglia. He is first mentioned in that connection, so far as is known, in a letter of 6th June 1451 (Doc. 91). However, he does not seem to have acted as a professional executive member of the building trade. He was called "nostro spenditore",⁴⁹⁰ and in a letter of 14th April 1452 he was called "nostro famiglio".⁴⁹¹ He seems to have been involved with the work at Pontemolino over an extended period, and it is possible that he controlled the work directly. His role may have resembled that of vicars, when building and engineering works were underway in their territories. He was required to report to Lodovico on the progress of work on 20th October 1451 (Doc. 104).

It does appear that the manpower of the Mantuan building trade extended beyond the strictly professional circle.⁴⁹² However, it is doubtful that Lodovico's deputies, like Gabriele da Crema and Ghisulfo (if that is what they were), would have had an effect on the shape of buildings.

The building trade workers named above and others who are unnamed carried out a multitude of jobs in the Mantovano. Works of fortification, hydraulic engineering, ecclesiastical building, private and public secular building, both in Mantua and in the territory, were many. However, the scale and importance of works is often unknown. A systematic description of all building work in the Mantovano is not possible. It is possible to give only

an indication of the complexity and considerable quantity of building activity in the 1450s.

Besides to the palace at Revere, to the works of fortification at Pontemolino and to the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, the documents presented here contain references to works in several places and of various kinds. In July 1449, Petro de Barbante was at work at the monastery of S. Giovanni (Docs. 59, 60). Lodovico Gonzaga had borrowed labourers for work at Ostiglia on 31st January 1450 (Doc. 62). Santa Maria del Carmine was to be provided with roof timbers on 20th August 1451 (Doc. 101). Work was being done at the Porta Predella on 8th October 1451 (Doc. 103).⁴⁹³ Lodovico proposed to build a Franciscan monastery at Revere in March 1452 (Docs. 110, 111). He acquired a site for it in June and July of 1452 (Docs. 115, 116). In summer 1458, he provided materials for the building (Docs. 194, 200). On 6th July, 1452 Petro de Barbante was at work on the fortress of S. Martino dell'Argine (Doc. 116). Lodovico was having work done at a mill "fora da porto" (perhaps at S. Giorgio) on 4th July 1455 (Doc. 133). His secretary, Marsilio Andreasi, wrote to Barbara on 4th August 1458, referring to works at Cavriana and Gonzaga (Doc. 201). Gian Antonio da Rezo was at work at Gonzaga in that year (Doc. 205, 206). On 19th October 1458, Zohanne de la Valle had received 8,000 bricks for "... el lavorerio del Corpo de Christo" (Doc. 209).⁴⁹⁴ From 1457, work was also done in the Castel di S. Giorgio. Luca Fancelli provided chimney pieces and, probably, window frames (Docs. 170, 173, 174, 215). On 17th June 1459, Antonio Manetti was sent from Mantua to acquire wood for a work

in the castle (Doc. 218). The chapel for which Mantegna was to provide pictures obviously comes to mind, but no evidence supports the conjecture.

The Mantuan State Archive contains other notices of building works of the period. For example, a letter of 19th March 1448, from Revere, carried a request that Lodovico send bricks and lime to S. Benedetto Po. The work was associated with the Feast of the Assumption - "questa sacratissima festa".⁴⁹⁵ On 21st May 1449, it was necessary to carry out repair works on the castle at Quistello "... che sta in ruvinare".⁴⁹⁶ A bridge was being built at Curtatone on 17th July of the same year.⁴⁹⁷ It is possible that building work of some kind was under way at Serravalle before 29th July 1450, when the vicar lent Sigismondo Muratore to Ostiglia.⁴⁹⁸ On 14th April 1451, there was reference to work at Borgoforte.⁴⁹⁹ As has been seen, Lodovico was at Borgoforte on 31st December 1451, when he wrote to Rolandino della Volta, instructing him to find Cinque (da Asola) and Giampetro (da Figino).⁵⁰⁰ Perhaps Lodovico wanted to consult them in connection with work at Borgoforte. Gian Antonio da Rezo was working there on 3rd August 1457,⁵⁰¹ and again on 22nd February 1460.⁵⁰² Maestro Cinque was at Belgiosio in August 1451.⁵⁰³ In February, he was mentioned in connection with works at Vitaliane.⁵⁰⁴ He was sent to Rulli, or Rollo, on 15th September, 1452, as has been seen.⁵⁰⁵ "Melchiori de Vitaliane muratore" was at work at S. Nicolo at Viadana in October 1451.⁵⁰⁶ On 12th May 1452, the vicar of Revere was ordered to supply materials to "ricoprire et recunzare la torre de Sermide et alcuni torresini,

et cussi la casa dela taverna de Villanova".⁵⁰⁷ Giampietro da Figino was required to go to Goito on 9th May 1453.⁵⁰⁸ Giovanni da Padova was at work at Castelmantovano on 20th March 1457.⁵⁰⁹ Nicolo Catabene announced to Lodovico that he had sent four masters there, on 21st November 1458.⁵¹⁰ In October 1457, Gian Antonio da Rezo was at work at S. Benedetto Po.⁵¹¹ On 4th October 1458, he had been working at Razolo.⁵¹² Rolandino della Volta wrote about works at Razolo and Luzzara on 18th November 1458.⁵¹³ On 22nd July 1458, Marsilio Andreasi wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg referring to work on "una stancia" - a dwelling or an apartment - at Poggio Rusco.⁵¹⁴

These few indications of works and personnel give some idea of the activity of the building trade in the Mantovano during the earlier part of Lodovico Gonzaga's rule. It will be evident that a general picture of Lodovico's activity as director of this considerable effort might emerge from the material of particulars when an extensive and detailed survey of archival data is correlated with historical and archeological study.

Under Lodovico's marquisate, works of many kinds were built, and many purposes were served. As well as military engineering and civil engineering projects, like the building of dykes and the cutting of canals, there were ecclesiastical works, and private and public building projects. Lodovico's rule comprehended involvement with the provision of all these kinds of works, with the various purposes that they served. The importance of these works is often difficult to gauge from the often inexplicit documentary references. Moreover, it is doubtful if the more

mundane purposes received specifically 'architectural' expression. Leaving aside military engineering works, many of which were undertaken and consisted, often, in mere repair work, the principal building projects of Lodovico's period may be noted.⁵¹⁵

Lodovico was involved with ecclesiastical works both in the city and in the territory. In Mantua there was the Ospedale di S. Leonardo - to be considered an ecclesiastical building rather than a secular one, for, although a plaque was placed to celebrate Lodovico's initiation of the work and the citizens of Mantua were called upon to contribute to the building fund, the administration of the foundation was invested in clerics, and the Pope was involved with proposals to build.⁵¹⁶ Lodovico supported the building of S. Maria del Carmine, ordering the supply of materials on 20th August 1451 (Doc. 101).⁵¹⁷ Lodovico was also involved with the rebuilding of the church of S. Pietro d'Ungheria. Amadei wrote that, in 1453, he ordered the demolition of the delapidated old church and began building another on the bank of the Lago Superiore. The Carmelites continued the work.⁵¹⁸ An unnamed small church was the subject of a letter of 19th August 1456 from Lodovico Gonzaga to Francesco d'Arco. The latter was asked to allow Fancelli to inspect some pieces of stone that might be suitable for a small church ("gesiola") that Lodovico proposed to build.⁵¹⁹ It is possible that Lodovico was involved with ecclesiastical projects before the arrival of Pius II for the council of 1459 - in order that the pope should have things to consecrate. Pius did perform consecrations at S. Francesco, S. Domenico and S. Agnese.⁵²⁰ The progress of work at Sta. Paola was of interest

to Lodovico, on 31st March 1460, for Fancelli informed him that there would be a delay on work on columns, because he was going off on a trip to Florence.⁵²¹ The church of S. Sebastiano was begun, according to designs by Alberti, in 1460.⁵²² Chambers suggests the possibility that Antonio Manetti, who died in late 1460 or early 1461, rather than Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, as has generally been assumed, produced a design for S. Andrea at about the same time, and it was to that design that Alberti referred in 1470,⁵²³ when he offered to provide his own measured drawing.⁵²⁴ Both buildings, begun during Lodovico's marquisate, were unfinished at the time of his death in 1478. Another proposal with which Alberti was involved concerned the church of S. Lorenzo, presumably the Romanesque rotunda with annular ambulatory, adjacent to the Torre del Orologio. However, nothing seems to have been done in the 15th century. The church became submerged in the ghetto, and was revealed by demolitions undertaken in 1907.⁵²⁵ As far as Lodovico's involvement is concerned, the Capella dell'Incoronata, linking the Cathedral with S. Paolo,⁵²⁶ should be called a posthumous work. It is to be associated with the period of his rule and with Lodovico himself because the Cathedral Chapter wrote to Federigo Gonzaga on 19th September 1480, asking that the building be erected and referring to a design prepared during Lodovico's time.⁵²⁷ Another project of Lodovico was the chapel of the Castle di S. Giorgio. A cupola covered the space and Mantegna's pictures were contained in gilded frames. Probably they were in the all'antica style.⁵²⁸

As patron of those buildings mentioned, Lodovico's role seems to have varied in importance. The hospital of S. Leonardo

and the church of S. Andrea, for example, were built with publicly donated funds.⁵²⁹ Lodovico was one among other benefactors. However, it is clear that in these cases, especially S. Andrea, he was pre-eminent among patrons, and was able to exercise choice over architectural form. He seems to have been the prime mover of the rebuilding of the church of S. Andrea.⁵³⁰ S. Sebastiano does not appear to have been a public work in the sense that S. Leonardo and S. Andrea were.⁵³¹ Fancelli was not salaried by an Opera, it seems, for, as has been seen, he wrote on 22nd February 1477 that he had not been paid by Lodovico for certain works undertaken between 1450 and 1466, including S. Sebastiano.⁵³² The chapel of the Castle di S. Giorgio was, of course, a private act of patronage.⁵³³

Out of town, Lodovico initiated the building of the monastery of S. Lodovico Re di Francia at Revere, in 1452.⁵³⁴ If he provided no other support to the parish church at Soave, he lent the services of Luca Fancelli and was going to meet the cost of his wages.⁵³⁵ However, the story of Lodovico having a vision on a journey between Soave and Goito, and being moved to build at Soave, suggests a stronger personal commitment to the work.⁵³⁶

Lodovico also carried out public secular works in town. His first important project was the systematisation of a number of loosely associated structures into the Palazzo del Broletto, or del Podestà.⁵³⁷ The work was directed by Gian Antonio da Rezo,⁵³⁸ and all or part of it must have been near completion by late summer 1462. Gian Antonio wrote about the painting of crenellations. So did Fancelli, on 12th August 1462 (Doc.231). Before 1466, Lodovico

set about building the Torre del Orologio at the south end of the Piazza del Mereato.⁵³⁹ It was probably substantially finished on 19th October 1470, when Lodovico wrote to Luca from Gonzaga, instructing him to confer with Alberti on the form of the letters of the inscription.⁵⁴⁰ The Casa del Mer^cato nearby was begun in about 1473.⁵⁴¹ Work was continuing on the building on 20th September 1477, when Lodovico wrote to Fancelli about it: "Alla casa del mercato ne piace che se lavori gagliardamente".⁵⁴² The principal private secular work of Lodovico in Mantua was the conversion of the Castel di S. Giorgio into his residence. The work appears to have consisted mostly in the provision of stone-carved details and furnishings.⁵⁴³ Of course, here, as in other residences, the work of painters was integral. The vault that accommodates Mantegna's ceiling fresco in the Camera degli Sposi was clearly built during Lodovico's time. Vaults of similar form should be similarly dated. In 1470, Lodovico began preparations for the building of the courtyard porticos in the ancient style. They occupy two of the four sides of the courtyard area.⁵⁴⁴ Another private work is worth mentioning, although it was not for Lodovico himself. It is a further indication of the spread of Lodovico's activity as a patron of architecture. He seems to have donated a work to someone else. Fancelli expected payment from Lodovico for works done before 1466. He wrote on 22nd February 1477 and referred to "opere di ligniame chome la Sala di Giacomo da Crema".⁵⁴⁵ It is possible that the Tuscan inscription on the cross-lintel of the house of Giovanni Boniforte, paying homage to Lodovico, expressed gratitude for a similar kind of service.⁵⁴⁶

The distinction between private and public secular works in the territory is not always as stark as in town. Lodovico had work done at several country residences. If the situation there resembled that at Revere, a part of which Lodovico proposed to refurbish in 1444 for his vicar (Doc. 50), the palace served a perpetual administrative function as well as a periodic residential one, and was associated with buildings of an administrative and defensive nature. Building work was done at Gonzaga,⁵⁴⁷ Cavriana,⁵⁴⁸ Saviola,⁵⁴⁹ Goito,⁵⁵⁰ Borgoforte,⁵⁵¹ Cavallara near Viadana⁵⁵² and perhaps also at the Gonzaga residence of Villa di Sacchetta.⁵⁵³

The above does not pretend to be a comprehensive account of building trade personnel before 1460, nor a complete list of the works carried out at Lodovico's instigation between 1444 and his death in 1478. It is, however, an indication of the scale and complexity of Lodovico's involvement with building in the Mantovano.

Summary

The palace at Revere was built in several distinct stages. During the last campaign, from about 1450 to 1458, when it was Lodovico 'Marchese' who gave impetus to the work, a number of different functions were to be served, and two distinct stylistic vocabularies were used. The result is a complex building, constructed in particular conditions. Only in a very specific sense, then, may it have served as a model for other buildings in the Mantovano. The history of construction of the palace that has been outlined fails to provide a single author for the building. Rather, it evolved through the co-operative efforts of various more or less autonomous individual craftsmen and groups. Attempts by students of the building to attribute all design work of the 1450s to Luca Fancelli must be reappraised, and attributions of other works with the same stylistic vocabularies as Revere must be viewed with caution. Reservations must be expressed in connection with "La Ghirardina" at Motteggiana, the Palazzo Secco at S. Martino Gusnago and the Ospedale di S. Leonardo in Mantua. Luca Fancelli's involvement with these projects need not be denied. But its extent may be debated. Questions of style must be separated from those of 'comparition'. And more developed arguments than those advanced hitherto are needed if Luca is to be recognised as designer of one or all of those buildings. The Ospedale di S. Leonardo presents a particularly complicated problem in that its principal stylistic characteristics do not seem to derive from the example at Revere.

If the palace at Revere served as a model to Fancelli, it

could have served other craftsmen in the Mantovano similarly. Lodovico Gonzaga undertook many building projects of many different kinds. He employed many skilled workmen. The management of the life of the territory seems to have been his principal purpose in busying himself so much with building. But his motives as a patron of architecture were also more complicated. Some of them are the subject of the next chapter.

VII. Lodovico as Patron of Architecture.

1. Perceptions of the Palace in the 15th Century.

The documents show that work was not done without Lodovico's approval. So, it is to an ambivalence, with changing emphasis, in Lodovico's ideas about building and architecture that the stylistic and typological mixture represented by the palace points. He was determinedly innovative in adopting classicizing forms for some details, but followed recent tradition in giving the palace its fortified aspect. Filarete, on the other hand, dispensed with these traditional forms and, in drawing palaces resembling Revere in their arrangement, offered thoroughly 'classical' examples, with cornices instead of battlements and pedimented towers (Fig.73). At Revere, in the choice of courtyard layout and classicizing details, there was a change of artistic priority. The forms that Lodovico used changed, but the nature of his response to them seems to have remained imaginative. Moreover, older sentimental values survived residually. Functional and formal-aesthetic justifications of the present courtyard layout did not have the effect of enabling him to consider building and its decoration together in architectural terms. His understanding of architecture in formal terms probably developed slowly and even then, perhaps, not as far as the merit of some of the works that he had built would suggest. The palace at Revere demonstrates a stage in the development of his understanding of architecture, and the history of its construction is a part of that development showing, at the same time as a developing taste and understanding of building

and architecture in some of its aspects, the adherence to certain traditional values.

Lodovico's motives as a patron, in constructing the palace, are likely to be no less complicated than the building is from stylistic, typological and functional points of view. As well as providing for his own utility in a mundane sense, the patron will be expected to anticipate the responses of others to his work. Sometimes too, he acts in response to others' expectations of him as a patron. His personal tastes have more obscure origins and do not anticipate responses. While taste, if it is not entirely idiosyncratic, may be a response to pressures like those of fashion and propaganda, the anticipation and manipulation of responses to his work is an activity. In the language of praise and flattery may be found willing reply to the tacit request for approval of the results of that activity. Flattery is conventional and answers a request. Therefore, although it is often fullsome, it is not unconsidered. The language of praise cannot describe objects precisely when its purpose is to praise the person who caused the object to be made. Only the qualities of objects may be described and then, only when such words might describe their makers. An object, insofar as it looks for it, is a public statement on the part of its maker. Praise which claims to be the outcome of an aesthetic response to an object which is contemporary with its maker believes that it has identified the maker's artistic intentions. It would be presumptuous to regard praise that now seems expressively impoverished and descriptively casual as evidence of a philistine naïveté in eulogisers. Rather the words

used should be trusted to have contained a depth of meaning that they no longer have.

The praises of several 15th century visitors suggest that the palace at Revere met with general approval. The monotony of the principal facade of the building (above called 'dignity'), the juxtaposition of all'antica details and towers and crenellations, the anomaly of 'gothic' columns and capitals supporting 'Tuscan' arches and the mixture of vaulting systems that, today, cause some consternation, did not dampen the enthusiasm of fifteenth century visitors, nor that of Ariosto in the sixteenth.⁵⁵⁴ Lodovico was proud of the building and evidently derived pleasure from its appearance (Docs. 180, 200). He encouraged people to visit and inspect it. On 15th May, 1458, Gian Marco da Rodiano, the vicar of Revere, wrote to Lodovico, "...el sono venuti qui messir Benedicto Souranzo et messir Francesco Bono secundo me ha scripto la Illu. et Ex.^a S. V. li quali hano visto et examinato tuto questo palazo a sufficiencia et ambidue ma piu messer Francisco che non l'havia piu visto l'hano sumamente laudato" (Doc. 190). Documents 175 and 177, and Document 193 refer to the visits of Zohanne da Mosto and Domenico di Pietro, a jeweller. In fact, Domenico di Pietro did not make the expected visit (Doc. 194). Lodovico himself showed the palace facade to the Bishop of Verona. His secretary, Marsilio Andreasi, reported the events of 14th July, 1458, to Barbara of Brandenburg. After visiting the site of the monastery of S. Lodovico Re di Francia just outside the castle, "... sono ritornati e stati a contemplare questa faciata e la porta..." (Doc. 200). An interested visitor asked permission

to inspect the building and, on 27th September, 1460, Marsilio reported to Barbara, "... qui e venuto quello Troilo di Zoguli compatre novo del prefato S. mio cum otto cavalli e ha facto dire ala S. Sua che voria ved(e)r il palazzo da Revere nel passar suo domane per andare a Ferrara" (Doc.228). On 14th February 1461 Zaccaria da Pisa wrote to Lodovico, "Ieri circha a 19 hore gionse a borgoforte l'ambasatore de La M.^{ta} del Re (Ferrante?) e parendogli a buonhora volse per ogni modo andare a Revere la sera e cosi io montay ne la sua nave e cum esso anday, aggiungendo circha ad un hora di notte. Questa matina veduto 'l palazzo piaciutolie commendatolo summamente. Monto in nave e ando a Ferrara..."⁵⁵⁵ The palace seems to have been quite celebrated. A famous visitor, Francesco Filelfo, expressed his enthusiasm for it. The factor of Ostiglia received news of his imminent arrival in a letter of 25th December, 1458: "El venira domane de sera ad alloggiare li messer francisco philelfo cum sei cavalli. Vogliamo che tu gli faci provvedere de le spese e logiamento a nostro costo e gli faci vedere il palazzo nostro da Revere" (Doc.214). He was en route to Rome.⁵⁵⁶ It is likely that Lodovico wanted him to see the palace for that aspect that Filelfo, when he mentioned it, concentrated upon - its antique appearance or scale. He wrote of the houses built "non coll' ordinaria ed umile forma, invece a somiglianza della maestà propria della lodatissima e arcibeata antichità".⁵⁵⁷ The same aspect drew Filarete's attention.⁵⁵⁸

The council held at Mantua in 1459 provided the occasion for other visitors to see the palace. The pope, Pius II, was impressed. He wrote in his Commentaries, "The next night was

spent at Revere where there is a royal palace only half complete which shows by its plan and workmanship the consummate genius of the architect".⁵⁵⁹ It is worth observing that Pius saw, behind the appearance of the building, the mind of one architect. He did not take the opportunity to commend Lodovico specifically or implicitly (though there was some reflected glory for Lodovico). Of course, unlike the praises of Filelfo and Filarete, Pius's were not intended for Lodovico's gratification. Rather, his commentaries were intended to give an account of his times to posterity. Praise is, here, rather warm. In referring to planning and workmanship, Pius seems to be making a more educated criticism of the form of the building that Filarete and Filelfo had made - or, at least, a more clearly worded one. Whilst their comments refer only to the visual effect of the work or its details, Pius remarked upon the quality of the means of its creation - planning and workmanship. His statement could not have been made except in the light of recollection of other works seen, so it is with a quality judgement presumably based on comparison with other un-named objects that he praised the workmanship. His comment about planning is evidence of his ability to think spatially and perhaps also to think about the convenience of the arrangement of parts of the building. Unfortunately, some of the internal spaces have been much altered (Fig. 55). But he may have been impressed by the original regularity of planning. There are no split levels in the elevation - something that Pius particularly approved of in his own palace at Pienza.⁵⁶⁰ Access to rooms was convenient, thanks to the corridors of the east and west wings, one of which, at least, was

built when Pius visited.⁵⁶¹ Perhaps, too, the placing in the north wing of amply proportioned rooms back to back, separated by the tower-joining wall and facing out, on one side to the north and, on the other, to the south, introduced, in that part of the building, an agreeable contrast of atmospheres.⁵⁶²

In Pius' retinue when he visited Mantua was Flavio Biondo who thought the palace worth mentioning in Italia Illustrata.

However, his words do not specify the source of his enthusiasm.⁵⁶³

The most expansive praise of the palace at this time came from Cardinal Roteno (Isidore of Kiev, the Patriarch of Constantinople),⁵⁶⁴ who visited it at the end of the council while en route to Ancona.⁵⁶⁵ He wrote to Lodovico to thank him on 29th January 1460 (Doc. 244²). On the previous day, the vicar reported Cardinal Roteno's remarks when he was shown the palace (Doc. 223). The terminology of the Cardinal's praise is rather imprecise and tends to obscure the aesthetic element that it may have contained. But, as he dispensed conventional praise, he was prolix, and it seems that the normal aesthetic response could be expressed satisfactorily in that rather woolly language instead of Pius' more precise terms.⁵⁶⁶

The critic would have viewed works with the aim of identifying in them generalised qualities, like richness, gravity or nobility. Art would deal with the universal rather than the particular. The very virtue of its critic's praise is that it does not describe the object exclusively, but concentrates upon generalised virtues that, although ostensibly applied to the building in this case, might equally apply to the prince. Pleasurable

sensations, no less, may arise in the recognition, in the building, of universally laudible qualities. In the terms of his critical intention, the dignity and magnificence, say, of an object are the creation of those qualities in the patron. Alberti's injunction that the quality of a building accord with the condition of its builder⁵⁶⁷ may be the statement of an aesthetic as well as a purely ethical-social imperative. For the eulogizer, ethical and aesthetic considerations are inextricably linked. Presumably, such princely virtues as strength, paternalism, pride and wealth would be sought in the prince's buildings. In fact, Roteno commended Lodovico for "la magnanimita e liberalita de quella, lo ingenio nel edificar di questo palazzo".⁵⁶⁸ These attributes of Lodovico - ingenio is associated with him whereas Pius had given it to the architect - produced a building that was commended with the words magnifico, apto and superbo. Ingenio would have made the palace apto, while magnanimità, and liberalità, would have made it superbo and magnifico. Praise of the palace and of Lodovico were equivalent. The building had merit insofar as the virtues that could be transferred to its maker were present and legible.

Magnificence and the other virtues equally of large buildings and wealthy people were suitable to both. Magnificence was the privilege of the wealthy.⁵⁶⁹ Filelfo had reason to approve of it.⁵⁷⁰ Frazer Jenkins observed that Alberti held a similar view.⁵⁷¹ In the light of it, magnificence, so far as Alberti - insistent that quality of building and of builder should accord - was concerned, becomes a duty of the richer classes for, without it, they do not objectify the characteristic that distinguishes them

from the poorer classes. Magnificence is further insinuated with the virtues by being linked up with beauty - both prerogatives of the rich.⁵⁷² Beauty causes pleasure and delight.

It is apparent that Alberti believed that expenditure should be commensurate with wealth.⁵⁷³ Magnificence was, for him, the fitting expression of wealth. Of course, if wealth may manifest itself in magnificence and magnificence is an aspect of moral virtue⁵⁷⁴ as well as social fitness, it is possible to imitate the manifestation without imitating the cause - namely virtue.⁵⁷⁵ Alberti seems to have understood this danger. His advice to the prospective house-builder to show moderation - the over-riding virtue⁵⁷⁶ - is evidence of his awareness of the necessary correspondence of means and ends. Also, his very specific advice to the tyrant⁵⁷⁷ seems to show that he considered him a special case. Where magnificence is both the cause and the effect of a building, the building has both content and form.⁵⁷⁸

Praise of a building without is concomitant praise for the patron was a poor return on the investment that the building represented. In the opinion of Cardinal Roteno, the condition of the population of the countryside and "...la fertilita, e molte abundantia di varie cose al viver del homo..." was as much cause for congratulation as Lodovico's "magnanimita e liberalita ... lo ingenio nel edificar di questo palazzo" and the fact that despite extensive travel and the opportunity to see palaces in Hungary, Greece and Italy "... mai .SS. non vidette il piu magnifico ni piu apto ni piu superbo palazzo di quello de la V.Ill.^{ma} S. di Mantua" (Doc. 223). Where praise is in order, the character of the prince, the

aspect of his buildings and the condition of the countryside are supposed to be linked together.⁵⁷⁹ Magnanimity is used of the prince and magnificence is used of the building. Liberality, a virtue closely associated with magnificence, is paralleled with expressions referring to the district, like fertility and abundance. The world, viewed for its qualities, is a metaphor for the prince.

In causing works of art to be created, the patron gave formal expression to his virtues. The publicity that his dignity acquired helped establish a conventional relationship with the observer, who would sooner transpose virtues from the object to its maker than seek to justify such a transposition. But, in the event of the transposition being justified, the patron was part-creator of the object in an effective way. That adjustment of means and ends - identified, with the use of such words as 'magnificent' and 'noble' - that, in the object itself, gave rise to agreeable sensations, is seen to extend itself beyond the work, so that the work of art is not only physical but social also.

2. Lodovico's 'Public Image'.

As well as what was in the patron, perhaps a habit of expectation that his works brought him credit under such headings as 'liberal', 'proud', 'dignified', there may have been a deliberate intention to display himself in a certain specific light. In those calculated actions that take account of the predilections and antipathies of an audience may be discovered a man's 'public image'. That image displays qualities or commitments that he, at least, believes to be unexceptionable. It is likely that they will not change to any great extent, but will probably be continuing preoccupations. Of course, the publicity may be directed towards specific audiences. For example, a man may be gratified that a small number of intellectuals consider him a protector of learning, but a larger number would approve of him in the role of protector of the public order.

Little clear evidence exists to show what was the public image that Lodovico sought to put about, but it is possible to identify some of the aspects of his rule for which he expected approval. His coinage was one of the things that achieved wide circulation and the imagery that it carried communicated part of his public image. The palace at Revere, insofar as it was a public building, may not be supposed to contradict values that Lodovico espoused publicly.

In his coinage, Lodovico emphasized strongly his role as protector of the relic of the blood of Christ. In fact, thirty-three of the forty-nine Lodovico Gonzaga coins listed in Corpus Nummorum Italicorum⁵⁸⁰ bear inscriptions referring to the relic. Of course,

this relic should have made Mantua one of the most important centres of Christendom. Perhaps repeated authentications failed to allay doubts about the possibility of such a relic being genuine.⁵⁸¹ Lodovico's coins proclaimed its authenticity. He emphasized his own importance as defender of the faith and ruler of the city that had charge of it. His grandest gesture towards this view of himself was his initiation of the rebuilding of the church of S. Andrea. In the beginning, at Revere, the monastery dedicated to S. Lodovico Re di Francia (Doc. 110), he venerated an outstanding example of the crusading prince, and perhaps stated publicly whom he regarded as his exemplar and patron. He also attributed to himself the zeal of the crusader against the infidel when he had other coins, of which four are listed, inscribed with the words, "In hoc signo vinc.". With the association with Constantine went the proclamation of a sort of Roman lineage - spiritual, at least. Skill in arms was also alluded to through the representation of George slaying the dragon on some other coins.⁵⁸² When the pope arrived in Mantua for the council, Lodovico, the militant Christian prince, aligned himself with the desire for a crusade against the Turks.⁵⁸³ Another motif that appears frequently in his coinage celebrated Virgil. For Lodovico, ancient culture also possessed a value with which he wished to be associated. As a Mantuan, of course, Virgil had to be a hero. When Platina wrote to Lodovico suggesting that he have made a statue of Virgil,⁵⁸⁴ Lodovico wrote back saying that he had already taken the necessary steps as far as the monument was concerned.

Objects that would be less well-known could be programmed

with greater ingenuity because they did not have to find a common denominator of comprehensibility: and medals, like emblems, were often designed, it seems, with a view to making their meanings obscure.⁵⁸⁵ Doubtless, explaining their recondite significance gave pleasure to those who had them made and invented. One medal made for Lodovico Gonzaga, however, not only has a relatively complicated programme but also is, except for some details, clear in its meaning. It was made by Melioli in 1475 (Fig. 116). On the reverse, Lodovico sits in Roman armour with a wreath round his helmet. In his right hand he carries a sword. The side of his chair is decorated with a dog. (cf. Fig. 66). Before him stand Faith and Minerva, the latter's shield bearing the head of Medusa. Round the rim of the medal is the inscription, "Fido. et. Sapienti. Principi. fides - .et. pallas assistunt". On the obverse, the words "Ludovicus .II. Marchi Mantuae quem preciosus .xpi. sanguis illustrat" contain a bust portrait of Lodovico. A line of small sunbursts decorates his breastplate below the gorgette. On the breastplate is embossed the Hydra and, below, the head of Medusa. Below the bust is a round shield bearing a tree-trunk and a dove (cf. Fig. 117). The Gonzaga and the Imperial arms also decorate this side. Here, Lodovico is represented, decorated with his military, religious and intellectual accomplishments. The medal shows a kind of Triumph. The military victor, bringing peace, has carried into battle the attributes of Minerva and Hercules and, back in Mantua, is honoured by his and state's patrons, wisdom and faith.⁵⁸⁶ He derives honour also from the most important relic of the city.

Lodovico is represented with similar attributes to those of Federigo da Montefeltro in the portrait of him with his son, Guidobaldo, formerly in his Studiolo at Urbino. Though with rather less rhetoric, military prowess, intellectual accomplishment and the religious life are alluded to, as they are in the medal.

Vittorino da Feltre, the teacher of both, would have approved of the balance of preoccupations that the images demonstrate. His teaching involved physical education and humanist studies, the end of which was the active Christian life. Most important, he taught by example, believing that virtue serves a pedagogical purpose.⁵⁸⁷ With Vittorino, teaching was more important than fame (for he was not a writer) - the action was more important than posthumous authority. In the medal, because of the emphasis on military preparedness, Lodovico exemplified a harmony of virtues more suitable in princes than in private citizens, but, surely, he still sought to present himself as a model of perfection or present his ambitions as such a model. When, to these qualities was added paternalism, a link was established between the prince and his subjects, and he could attempt to put himself beyond public criticism. Pius II also combined the active life of politics, and later the politics of war, with scholarly activity and the religious life. He described Lodovico in his Commentaries in terms such as those that the medal might suggest: "Lodovico was famous for his prowess in arms and his knowledge of letters, for he equalled his father's military glory: under the instruction of the orator Vittorino he almost attained to the learning of his teacher. He was of a mild disposition but very strict in his observation of

justice".⁵⁸⁸ His own attachment to the ideal of the physically active life he emphasized in his letter to Ladislas of Hungary.⁵⁸⁹ Wisdom, he held, gave men power over circumstances. It was partly constituted of the lessons of history and its absence weakened power.⁵⁹⁰ Vittorino, whose thought was influenced by the Stoics,⁵⁹¹ would have agreed with Pius when he wrote, "It is a function of true wisdom...to enable us to bear the variations of fortune".⁵⁹² Alberti, too, having taken minor orders, was a scholar and an athlete, according to his biography,⁵⁹³ and lived this three-part life.⁵⁹⁴ Even without the evidence of the medal, Lodovico's military activities, his support of the church and his education would suggest preoccupations similar to those of Vittorino,⁵⁹⁵ Federigo da Montefeltro, Alberti and Pius. In the medal, he made their association explicit.

What Lodovico intended to be understood about himself from his portraits in the Camera degli Sposi⁵⁹⁶ is difficult to grasp - especially since the subject of the pictures has still not been satisfactorily explained. But it should not be surprising that he caused to be created an image of thematic complexity. The Camera would have received relatively little publicity, measured in terms of numbers of visitors, and a simple posture taken up by Lodovico would have added little to what those few visitors already knew through other imagery. The events painted on the walls seem too casual to have been memorable and suggest, in fact, the absence of a theme.⁵⁹⁷ But the mere size and elaborateness of the pictorial scheme suggest the contrary.⁵⁹⁸ Kristeller saw the pictures as celebrations of Lodovico as head of his family and

dynasty and of Lodovico in relation with the church.⁵⁹⁹

However, if the decoration of the room was programmed, what is simple and obvious, as well as what is of more obscure significance, should be pertinent. The programmer should have been aware of all observable levels of meaning. For example, the situation in which the pictures were viewed was more complicated when Lodovico was alive. Probably, the visitor often shared the real space of the room with Lodovico himself, under the elaborately-painted vault with its simulated reliefs of episodes of classical mythology and busts of Roman emperors. These simulated artifacts are set into an architectonic framework that extends downwards to become the painted-pillars that articulate the real space and are present in the painted spaces of the Letter and the Meeting. Lodovico, then, appeared in three 'episodes' and the decorative architectonic scheme of the room itself bore a relationship both with the real prince and with the figured versions. The reticent postures of the painted Lodovicos must be given a more rhetorical significance when brought into relationship with the opulently-decorated and grandiose-programmed vault of the room. Evidently, Lodovico was equally at home in the setting decorated with painting and in the painted settings. The emperors, then, pay homage to him and even Hercules' Labours are a kind of tribute. A similarity of virtues or interests binds Lodovico to them both.⁶⁰⁰ The mythological 'reliefs' may have elucidated that similarity or have complemented it in some way. Since the emperors may not all be held up unequivocally before posterity as exemplars of moral rectitude⁶⁰¹ some non-moral characteristic probably ties

them together. Their most obvious association is as native Roman emperors over the first 69 years of the Empire. Although there may be some other common factor that the visitor may have observed, he cannot have overlooked the most obvious one. He would have concluded that an analogy was being made between Imperial Rome and Mantua. The statement was political and the glory of Imperial Rome was continued in the Mantua of the Gonzaga. The gate-tower of the city in the background of the Meeting has been rebuilt on top of ancient remains and decorated with a plaque carrying the Imperial eagles which also appear on Lodovico's arms. Although the city looks more like Rome, its rulers might well be the Gonzaga. Lodovico could not claim to have found the city of Mantua of brick and left it of marble, but he did undertake extensive works of urban renewal and may have thought that his city had achieved glory that bore comparison only with Imperial Rome.⁶⁰² He may have been intending his rule to appear as an Augustan age.⁶⁰³ His adoption of the punning motto 'Par un Sol Desir' gives rise to conjecture about the possibility of Lodovico intending to a 'sun' prince under the patronage of Apollo, like Augustus.

As well as advertize his piety, military skill and erudition, it were well on some occasions if the prince would advertise his paternalism. However, whereas the first three qualities might be publicized through objects as well as actions, paternalism could be expressed best to those who would appreciate it - his subjects - through action. Perhaps no suitable, readily comprehensible imagery existed to express it. Allegory, that tends to be arcane, would not have served. But it was certainly important to Lodovico

that the territory should be seen to prosper. During peace-time, he concentrated upon improvements to the industry and agriculture of the marquisate.⁶⁰⁴ He involved himself with Platina's work on the history of Mantua⁶⁰⁵ and, surely Platina's words about Lodovico's activities were not chosen without a view to what would be acceptable - if Lodovico did not give specific instructions about what should be written.⁶⁰⁶ The account is factual and prosaic and the facts were, in themselves, commendation of the policy.⁶⁰⁷ More definitely disinterested comment on the condition of the countryside - as a function of the worth of the prince - was made by Cardinal Roteno.

Lodovico adopted a deliberate posture as far as those values mentioned are concerned. Projects that he embarked upon with equal deliberateness may not be inconsistent with the image that that posture tried to create. While the countryside benefitted from good husbandry and good government, there is reason to believe that the palace at Revere was a proprietorial statement of lordship, and, in its military aspect, the promise of protection for the flourishing region. At least, anyone wishing to propagandise on behalf of the idea of the recovery of ancient art and letters could have found, in the all'antica details of the building, evidence of the erudition of its builder.

3. Obligations to be a Patron.

Not only was the patron in a position to control others opinions of him. He was himself also subject to pressures. As has been seen, Alberti regarded magnificence as a duty as much as a privilege of the wealthy. Patronage of the arts and crafts was recommended on those and on other grounds - and not always by people who expected to benefit directly. When there existed a vocabulary for praising the wealthy in specific terms, it cost money to be worth that praise. 'Liberality', 'magnanimity', 'magnificence', 'splendor' were not cheaply-acquired words of commendation, and a confession of poverty was cause for shame among peers.

It was not so difficult to confess poverty to the less-articulate beneficiaries of patronage. Francesco Filelfo managed his affairs quite well,⁶⁰⁸ but others had less efficient levers on the purses of princes. Certainly, with regard to the buying part of the bargain, Lodovico, when short of money, as appears not infrequently to have been the case, required patience of the artists he employed. Lorenzo 'Scarpellino' - probably the same stone-carver who was involved with the columns at Revere - had grounds for complaint.⁶⁰⁹ On 22nd February (1477), Fancelli complained that he had not been paid for a number of works done between 1450 and 1466.⁶¹⁰ Mantegna, too, was unhappy about remuneration on 13th May 1478, when he wrote a bitterly recriminating letter to Lodovico and complained, "... it appears that I swim in milk under the shadow of your Serenity..."⁶¹¹ In fact, Mantegna had his own problems. Felice Feliciano sought his (Mantegna's) patronage in a begging sonnet.⁶¹² Lodovico

seems to have used the expectation, or hope, of rewards as a means of keeping his employees' "noses to the grindstone". In reply to a letter of 1457 from Luca Fancelli asking for an investment of land, Lodovico advised patience and circumspection but, most insistently, the completion of the work under way at the time - after which, it would be possible to "dar expeditione a questa facenda..." (Doc.168). He responded similarly to Alberti's request for the benefice of S. Salvatore.⁶¹³ Of course, it is normal practice to receive the goods before paying the bills. For this reason, scholars and eulogizers could find themselves in an especially weak position.⁶¹⁴ However, Lodovico paid out money to Francesco Filelfo and apologised when he was unable to do so.⁶¹⁵ Gonzaga poverty, though sometimes actual,⁶¹⁶ was not something to confess, for shame attached to it. Economies with regard to what may be called, loosely, luxuries, were mortifying. Lodovico's letter of 29th October, 1462, to Barbara casts light upon one of the imperatives forcing Lodovico to behave as he did as a patron. He had been told that certain window hangings required for the palace at Revere should be paid for by himself: "che certo ne rincresse perche se'l se debe stare in questa alternatione (parts old and parts new) ne pare che la sia la via de farne ricevere vergogna. Nui spendemo fin che possiamo ..." (Doc.233). When faced with economic difficulties but required, nonetheless, to spend conspicuously, the prince had, of course, gone beyond the strict injunction of Alberti - one that was more suitable for a bourgeois - that expenditure be related to wealth. The air of princeliness had to be maintained in spite of circum-

stances, for the posture itself fulfilled a purpose. Lodovico was also fearful of giving evidence of his poverty when he wrote to Barbara on the following day about Ponte Molino: "...perche havendo a venirge el duca de Modena e vedere li lavoreri in quella forma abandonati, ne parte sera pur tropo gran demonstrat-ione de la povertade nostra..." (Doc. 234).

Artists and craftsmen, the creators of the richness of the physical environment, were probably sufficiently necessary to the prince to be in quite a strong bargaining position. The recommendations of patronage of the visual arts offered by Filarete, the spokesman of artists and craftsmen, were probably not totally without justification and such arguments as his were probably not totally without effect. Rewards to artists were probably not as inadequate as Mantegna pretended⁶¹⁷ and it is likely that Lodovico, despite certain lapses, was not a totally ruthless exploiter of artists.

Before any strictly personal or specifically propaganda purpose, the commissioning of works of art appears to have served a more mundane one. Filarete recommended building to Francesco Sforza not only because it graces the environment but also because it provides employment and keeps wealth circulating within the community.⁶¹⁸ The Medici for example, were conscious of their service to the community through patronage.⁶¹⁹ This sort of recommendation would most likely come from artists themselves, for building was not a productive investment of capital.⁶²⁰ With regard to architecture, when public works were commissioned, the purpose may have been in the patron's

mind. Lodovico Gonzaga and Francesco Sforza built hospitals, which had the further advantage of being 'good works'. In 1430, in response to worsening economic conditions, Gian Francesco Gonzaga called together an advisory committee. Its recommendations included ideas for improving local industry, undertaking works of civil engineering, restoring houses and the 'Casa del Mercato', engaging a salaried teacher of grammar and encouraging foreigners to settle in the city and territory.⁶²¹ Lodovico carried out many of the suggested improvements.⁶²² Architectural patronage was, among other things, an economic measure.

Filarete also recommended building projects because they ensured the prince's fame against posterity's forgetfulness. When Alberti advised architects to serve praiseworthy patrons (IX, 2), he probably thought of the architect fulfilling a role like that of the biographer of princes. Literary accounts provided them with fame in perpetuity. The building serves as an account of the greatness of the patron in a similar way. There is mendacity in the literato or architect who bestows fame on the undeserving. Concern with fame is understandable in a society that had the notion of a Dark Age, when even the finest traditions and the noblest examples - fixed points in the changing world - were casually or callously obliterated.

But the employment of artists also served the fame of the patron in the shorter term. They could be ambassadors reflecting distinction on their employers and their places of origin. Filarete proclaimed that he was a Florentine all over the bronze doors of St. Peter's in Rome. He was not modest about

his achievement. The doors' importance and his skill glorified Florence (or confirmed the city's artistic preeminence). Artists were lent and borrowed and regarded themselves as representatives of their princely employers. Mantegna, in Rome in 1489 to paint a chapel for Innocent VIII, regarded himself in this way.⁶²³ So did Fancelli when at work, in 1491, on the project for the facade for S. Maria del Fiore in Florence.⁶²⁴ Perhaps the Medici found an excess supply of skilled labour in the building trade in Florence as great projects were nearing completion and adopted a deliberate policy of dispersal - encouraging masters like Michelozzo, Bernardo Rossellino, Pagno di Lapo and Luca Fancelli to work abroad.⁶²⁵

Another, not specifically artistic way that an artist might be employed at home may be suggested. Just as poverty was to be hidden, so were eyesores. Like the housewife, the prince might exert himself in order that untidiness should not be seen. In 1458, Lodovico made strenuous efforts to bring Donatello to Mantua from Siena to finish the arca of St. Anselm. He wrote to Gianfrancesco Soardo, the Podestà of Siena, on 7th November, "..."⁶²⁶ *a Kalende de zugno debi ritrovar qui cum la corte (Pius II) e non voressemo per modo alcuno che'l si trovasse Sancto Anselmo in questa forma...*⁶²⁷ Aristotele da Bologna's work to straighten the tower that was out of plumb⁶²⁸ merely tidied up the appearance of the city.

A related intention is suggested - that to see work in progress was better than seeing nothing being done - by the fact that, in the case of Donatello, Lodovico cannot have hoped that it

would be possible to complete the arca of St. Anselm before the Pope's arrival. The same was probably his wish in 1459 with regard to Mantegna's removal to Mantua. Since 1457, negotiations had been going on. Even when Lodovico knew that the council was going to convene in Mantua - only about six months before - he was still willing to allow more time for the completion of work at Verona (although it must be admitted that he may have had diplomatic reasons for being long-suffering). Mantegna's presence at Mantua during the council rather than the sight, for guests, of finished works, was important. Lodovico's proposed employment of Michele Ungaro in 1458 was perhaps similarly motivated.⁶²⁹

4. Patronage, Historicism and Erudition. The Patron as Architect.

There is a difference between being a patron and seeking to elicit admiration or achieve fame for virtue, power or whatever through commissioned works of legible merit, and being a patron and expecting admiration for that fact alone. It is possible to argue that, at the time of the Council, Lodovico had a notion of the intrinsic value of patronage⁶³⁰ and that to be seen employing artists was regarded as praiseworthy in itself. In that case, the visual arts were emancipated alongside the liberal arts, the patronage of which, because virtù both seeks and knows a good end, is virtuous.⁶³¹ Provided artists possessed ingenio the patron could keep faith with it.⁶³²

At this point, the patron who has been seen as subject to pressures is introduced to a new value which re-establishes his freedom. Filarete suggested the way in which the patron was required to follow a course of action dictated by outside pressures and was permitted, at the same time, to follow his own inclination, or personal taste. With the resolution of this dichotomy, patronage of the visual arts was laudible in itself. It occupied itself, not with manipulation of responses in a political way, over the head of the artist, but with the antique, and matters of erudition, archeology and architectural form. It is a point of change, and Lodovico seems to have reached it while building the palace at Revere.

Recommending the ancient style to his patron, Francesco Sforza, Filarete noted that, originally used in ecclesiastical

buildings, it was readily accepted for private building. He referred to the Palazzo Rucellai and the palace at Revere, as has been seen.⁶³³ Lodovico was in the vanguard of progress towards the general acceptance of the ancient style. Imitation of Lodovico obliged his patron to adopt it, just as, in 1458, Cosimo de'Medici was put forward as a worthy object of imitation for Francesco Sforza.⁶³⁴

The style also had the merit, for Filarete, of being the most beautiful (though what constituted beauty for him is unclear). Perhaps it was beauty that justified the appropriation of stylistic motifs that had a specific typological location - in public buildings - and permitted what might otherwise have been seen as a transgression of the rules of decorum. It would give the patron pleasure. It was also laudible for the patron, like Lodovico and Giovanni Rucellai, to have an eye for beauty, as it was to be in the vanguard of progress. Filarete's arguments took account both of the personal gratification that would follow from adopting it and of the approval of others seeing its adoption. To the rewards he offered - status as a man of quality, pleasure in the contemplation of beauty and being an advanced thinker on matter of taste - Filarete added another. The ancient style, being applicable to public and private buildings - its merit existing independently of its uses - commends itself because it is admirable in itself.⁶³⁵ The patron is to be commended for concurring with the demand that the style, on account of its objectively existing merit, makes for its own recognition. He plays his part in the advance of a historic movement towards its universal acceptance. Filarete's sometimes

immoderate-seeming enthusiasm for it came out of a desire to see that the style that deserved to exist should exist in fact.⁶³⁶

It has been observed that Filarete's house projects were, like the palace at Revere, for traditional buildings reconstructed in the ancient style (when they were not the fantastical buildings of Plusiapolis). All he sought was the replacement of styles - the ancient for the modern. Useable by bankers as well as marquises and dukes, it did not itself distinguish the quality of one from another. Scale, and symbol perhaps, saw to that.⁶³⁷ A hierarchy of orders could not be used plausibly to distinguish social groups if one building - the Palazzo Rucellai - could use several orders.⁶³⁸ Filarete's investigations of the antique were not concerned, as were those of Alberti and Brunelleschi, with methodological as well as stylistic problems. He was concerned with it as visual data.⁶³⁹ The recovery of a decorative vocabulary seems to have been what he sought for the transformation of Milan. He introduced his patron to a world of obscure scholarship, of treasure-trove and encoded information, and gave an air of erudition to the patron in the fictitious narrative of the treatise when the 'Golden Book' was found. It was a fantasy source of knowledge - as excitingly recondite as Cesariano's Vitruvius of the following century. Filarete cheated, perhaps, because real data was wanting. So, at the same time as providing Galeazzo Maria with practical instruction about architecture and drawing, he rewarded his ideal patron with the erudition of the archeologist.

For Lodovico Gonzaga, building S. Sebastiano and S. Andrea - and perhaps other buildings too - there appears to

have been the intention to make what are now obscure archeological points. In 1470 Alberti recommended his design for S. Andrea on archeological grounds.⁶⁴⁰ Giovanni Aldobrandini criticized the choir of SS. Annunziata on similar grounds in 1471.⁶⁴¹

In the 15th century in Italy, praise of the architectural skills - practical and scholarly - of princes and patrons was not uncommon. There are several ways in which the patron may provide for fame in perpetuity. He may celebrate his own virtues, real or imaginary, in his monuments: he may imitate an earlier patron whose fame he sees undamaged - either the like of an Emperor Trajan whom posterity commends for a specific virtue, or an Augustus who, magnificent and liberal, is a worthy example:⁶⁴² he may understand patronage as a virtue in itself; or he may imitate the artist in his quest for fame - imitate the efficient cause rather than just the moving cause. When art is concerned with the particular rather than the universal - or, when art has intrinsic value rather than value symbolic of the moving cause - the creativity of artist is an expanding realm and the patron's a shrinking one. The patron might have had reason to imitate the artist. Alberto Avogadro wrote, "Cosimo (de'Medici), you have followed the example of the skilled (doctus) painter who desired eternity for his name."⁶⁴³ Vespasiano da Bisticci wrote of Cosimo's knowledge of architecture and of his practice of discussing projects with architects and others.⁶⁴⁴ Francesco Sforza was aware of Cosimo's interest in architecture. In June, 1456, he wrote through his secretary to Cosimo, "... sappiamo che voi ve delectati del murare e del

hedificare".⁶⁴⁵ Federigo da Montefeltro's practice was the same as Cosimo's.⁶⁴⁶ Alfonso of Aragon is believed to have exercised considerable control over the design of his triumphal arch of Castel Nuovo.⁶⁴⁷ Lorenzo de 'Medici is said to have taken a very practical interest in architecture for, besides receiving Poliziano's dedication of the first printed edition of Alberti's De Re in 1485⁶⁴⁸ he was eulogised by Filippo Redditi who wrote, "How greatly he excels in architecture! In both private and public buildings we all make use of his inventions and his harmonies".⁶⁴⁹ Lorenzo also interested himself in the proposals for the facade of S. Maria del Fiore, offering his own design.⁶⁵⁰ Platina, in an oration delivered in 1478 spoke similarly to Lodovico Gonzaga, "Est operae pretium audire te de aritmetica, aut de geometria aut de architectura aliquid disputatem".⁶⁵¹ Praise of and comment upon special skills in the patron making him resemble a practising artist, indeed, did not neglect Lodovico. Filarete, as has been seen, regarded him as "... a most educated man... especially in architecture".⁶⁵² Giovanni Aldobrandini, writing to Lodovico from Florence on 23rd March, 1471, and criticizing the design for the choir of SS. Annunziata, seems to have been using more than just conventional praise: "...rifandomi la V. Ill. S. essere di queste cose (architectural matters) experta ...".⁶⁵³ Also in connection with proposals for the choir of the church, Giovanni da Gaiole wrote, "... universalmente lo' siete tenuto e siete intendentissimo". Form in buildings became creditable or reprehensible, for Giovanni continued, "... e sarebbe piu imputato all S.^{ria} Vostra

che a un altro e a vostro caricho", ⁶⁵⁴ if the work on the rotonda was continued in accordance with the manner in which it had been begun.

Such respectful remarks as these may or may not be sincere. They may also be the cause or the effect of the patron's opinion of himself as architecturally competent. It remains to be seen whether Lodovico was moved by flattery to suppose himself knowledgeable about architecture or whether it was a genuine interest that gave him knowledge or entitled him to that praise. In either case, there is no proof of the genuineness of his skill. But irrespective of the facts of the matter, Lodovico believed that he possessed a special knowledge of architecture and building. Apparently, he said that Luca Fancelli had taught him architecture. ⁶⁵⁵ Clifford Brown published a group of letters of 1475 confirming that Lodovico regarded himself as Fancelli's pupil. ⁶⁵⁶ Evidence of Lodovico's confidence in his knowledge is his tongue-in-cheek reticence when he wrote, "Though it is not the student's place to criticize the master..." and proceeded to insist that Fancelli alter parts of the design of a house at Cavallara near Viadana. ⁶⁵⁷

When arguments were raging about the design for the choir of SS. Annunziata, Lodovico remained intransigent before arguments to change it. A number of motives, as well as perhaps sheer obstinacy, probably caused him to take up an immovable position. But there may have been an over-riding concern of an aesthetical-polemical kind. The claim that he did not intend the building to be the finest in Florence ⁶⁵⁸ and

the statement that he did not really like the building,⁶⁵⁹ seem like imposture when the gist of his letter to the Signori was that the building should be erected as he wanted or else it would not be built with his money and that it was unacceptable "...che havendo io a spendere li denari mei non dovessi spenderli secondo il voler mio...".⁶⁶⁰ Lodovico's use of the first person singular rather than the plural is unusual. Here, it is apparent that he wanted one design used, and no other. The humble chapel in memory of his father, that he claimed was sufficient,⁶⁶¹ was in fact insufficient to his artistic or propaganda purpose. So, it seems that he was being insincere when he deprecated the design. The determination he showed in resisting pressures to substitute a new - old fashioned - design⁶⁶² may, then be said to be a function of his confidence in his architectural judgement or, it must be said, advice.⁶⁶³ The reply of the Signori to the threatening letter of 27th May 1471 was ingratiating. It commended the design that Lodovico wanted. In the choice of words may be evidence of the recognition by the Signori of Lodovico's reason for single-mindedness: "Sed hoc quod in aede dive Annuntiatae tam magnifice et tam docte tollat".⁶⁶⁴ The word 'docte' was used so that Lodovico would be gratified. Lodovico was clearly thought to have intended the building to be evidence of his learning. In this light, Giovanni Aldobrandini's criticism of the choir on account of its functional differences from its antique prototypes was pertinent.⁶⁶⁵ The reading of the tone of willfulness in the expression "secundo il voler mio" was sensible.⁶⁶⁶ Lodovico considered himself a well-informed

judge of architecture. He was also considered as such. These facts, however, do not, by themselves, imply a knowledge of any great depth. And, since education was continuous, it is not possible to be clear about the degree of Lodovico's preparation at any particular time. He said that he regarded himself as a student in 1475. Yet, in the early 1460s, Filarete called him intendentissimo. It is necessary to suppose that Lodovico's knowledge of architecture, if not necessarily building, was rudimentary in the 1450s, while the palace at Revere was under construction.

The educational purpose of Filarete's Trattati, with regard to the patron, is obvious. It is perhaps less obvious in De Re', insofar as quantities of technical information are included. However, Alberti wrote in Latin, to recommend his work to the educated classes. Then, eschewing Filarete's device of narrative entertainment, Alberti discussed the radical principles of architecture and, more than Filarete, showed that the art was not mysterious, practised by a free-masonry. Frazer Jenkins has emphasized that Alberti's treatise deals with architecture as an art worthy of the interest of the patron,⁶⁶⁷ rather than as a means of expression for him. For example, pragmatism was necessary when choosing a site. It is the choice that a patron might make.⁶⁶⁸ The principles of making and judging are the same, so the critic and the practitioner are not distinguished by special innate abilities.⁶⁶⁹ The mathematics of architecture which, itself, is a denial of practical structural complexity, would not be included if they

were not expected to be comprehensible. A schooling in arithmetic, geometry and music - under Vittorino da Feltre, for example⁶⁷⁹ - would have been sufficient. A man of such education would find pleasure in the internal mathematical consistency of systems and would perhaps enjoy the ingenuity of mathematical functions that governed classical architecture as he understood it.

Lodovico was confident about his knowledge and he was conscious of its limitation. His correspondence with Alberti shows that. Alberti perhaps fostered in his mind the notion of architecture, alluded to by the Signori of Florence when they used the word docte, as an erudite exercise. However, Lodovico seems sometimes to have understood less than Alberti. It is because he confessed his failure to understand that it is clear that Lodovico was not embarrassed by it. But he expected to be made to understand. Others too were bemused, and more than once Alberti dispaired of being able to convey to them the merit of his designs, though he was confident that, in the finished works it would become apparent. SS. Annunziata was not the only building whose novelty left people uncomprehending.⁶⁷¹ Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga did not know what to make of S. Sebastiano.⁶⁷² It is a very unusual building.

Although Lodovico seems sometimes to have failed to understand Alberti's ideas,⁶⁷³ it is not clear whether that was because of the novelty of the designs or their presentation. Lodovico, himself, knew that he was breaking new ground in 1457 when he wrote to Fancelli about the design for the cornice

al'antiqua that his craftsmen would probably not understand (Doc. 170). Fancelli's understanding continued to be ahead of others.⁶⁷⁴ On 23rd October, 1470, Lodovico wrote from Gonzaga to Alberti about the design for S. Andrea, "Havemo visto el designo de quello tempio ne haveti mandato, el quale prima facie ne piace; ma perche non la possiamo ben intendere a nostro modo, aspectaremo che siamo a Mantova, poi parlato che habiamo cum vui et dictovi la fantasia nostra, et intesa anche la vostra, faremo quanto ne parera sia il meglio.".⁶⁷⁵ He dignified his own idea with the word fantasia. He readily confessed his incomprehension but there was no modesty in conceiving of a struggle between his idea and Alberti's.

Although in 1470 Lodovico conceived of a confrontation between his fantasia and Alberti's, it is unlikely that he was always so self-opinionated in his dealings with Alberti. He cannot, surely, have been prepared for the startling novelty of S. Sebastiano in 1460, but must have listened to Alberti's exegesis. In 1470 Lodovico was confident. But Alberti's letter about S. Andrea does not contain expressions of respect for Lodovico's opinions as they were contained implicitly in his approval of Manetti's design. Alberti considered Lodovico's tastes and requirements to be mute and himself the tool for their expression: "Vidi quel modello del Manetti. Piaqqemi. Ma non mi par apto a la intentione vostra".⁶⁷⁶ He appealed to Lodovico's desire that the building be evidence of his learning when, of his own design, he wrote, "Questa forma de tempio

se nomina apud veteres 'Etruscum Sacrum' ".⁶⁷⁷ But perhaps an indication of the grandeur and magnificence of Alberti's proposal is to be inferred from the use of the word Sacrum. The word itself - meaning holy place or holy thing - implies a small and shrine-like object. But Alberti's church being eterno, ampio and degno - words referring to the large size of the building - it would be an enlarged version of the Sacrum and would be on a scale more than merely heroic. His other words describing the design would appeal to Lodovico. The new church would be more solidly constructed (eterno), spacious (ampio), less lugubrious (lieto), more worthy of the relic or the city or the prince or all three (degno). Being cheaper (perhaps because fewer carved stones would be used), a shameful confession of poverty would be less likely in the future, incidentally.⁶⁷⁸

The interest in the practical business of architecture shown by patrons in the 15th century allowed them to maintain close links with the buildings that they had constructed, when they were deprived, to some extent, of the expressive possibilities recognised by the language of praise, used by Cardinal Roteno. In a world like that of Vittorino, Pius, Federigo, Alberti and Lodovico, where education and scholarship implied activity, classicizing architecture, objectively beautiful, with its associations of erudition and its archeological and historical foundation - and with its historiographical fitness - followed suit. Where virtù is concerned, theory and practice are not distinguished.⁶⁷⁹ The educated patron who, Giovanni da Gaiole

warned, would be blamed for practical and aesthetic deficiencies in buildings, could cause a building to exist specifically, in a formal way, rather than generally and in an unindividualized way.

Lodovico interested himself in the practical side of building. Documentary evidence exists in the Mantuan archive to show that he ordered the day-to-day problems of the Mantuan building trade and of individual sites. When not present, he demanded information insistently. Moreover, he was doctus and intendentissimo in the opinion of contemporaries. His interest was more than that of a mere executive, one of whose tasks was the administration of building and works (though it should be remarked that Lodovico may have had difficulty in investing others with sufficient authority to enable them to carry out works successfully). On 6th July 1472, he went to S. Andrea and ordered the erection of scaffolding. Luca Fancelli was rather irritated by his interference.⁶⁸⁰

In one of the letters published by Clifford Brown demonstrating the student-teacher relationship between Lodovico and Luca, Lodovico wrote instructing Luca to come to Borgoforte with some equipment, "... perche zobia di mattina deliveramo andare a Cavallara per dessignare et squadrare quella casa li. Et tu sai che in questi principii el discipulo non puo far bene senza el magistro..."⁶⁸¹ He wrote using similar language on 26th April, 1472, to Luca on the subject of the loggia of the Castel di S. Giorgio: "... et a cio che tu intendi meglio te mandiamo questo disegno facto per mano de Andrea Mantegna

che credemo sera casone de fare chel maestro intenda el dissipulo".⁶⁸² Lodovico's ironical sense of humour has been observed before⁶⁸³ and found expression later in letters to Luca.⁶⁸⁴ It is unlikely that Mantegna was the 'dissipulo'. Otherwise, Lodovico made a joke on Mantegna's behalf. The drawing was probably worked up from sketches and spoken instructions given by Lodovico to Mantegna. Luca's letter, of 12th August, 1462, in which he asked for "uno pocho di schizo" should Lodovico have any ideas regarding the decoration of the Palazzo del Podestà (Doc. 231) may show that the latter was capable of making sketches himself. Rossi remarked upon Lodovico's development of that skill.⁶⁸⁵ Cottafavi merely wrote of the letter of 26th April, 1472, "Fancelli è adunque il maestro che attende nel 1472 all' erezione del portico di castello secondo i desideri e il volere del marchese Federico (sic) il quale a meglio spiegare il suo pensiero manda un disegno fatto da Andrea Mantegna".⁶⁸⁶ Lodovico may also have conceived a design for the Capella dell' Incoronata in the Cathedral - a building that is reminiscent of the church of the Badia at Fiesole⁶⁸⁷ and that would have resembled it more closely had the 'crossing' been vaulted with a dome on merging pendentives as in the side chapels.

Lodovico considered himself an amateur architect. With his master, Fancelli, he was presumably trying to develop his skills in 1475. But earlier too, he had designed buildings. On 15th March, 1458, Marsilio Andreasi reported to Barbara of Brandenburg that Lodovico went to Ostiglia and Ponte Molino,

"... e ritorno qui (Revere) a XXII hore e subito se mise a dissignare le botege che'l vole far qui cum una casa da munitione". (Doc.181). On 4th January, 1461, Antonio Donati wrote from Governolo,

"El Signore fu heri a Pontemolino et a la torre de mezo dove Sua Si. fece certo desegno per fortificare quello loco cioe la torre per accesso. Poi vene ala rocha de hostia e li fece certo altro desegno". (Doc.230)

Luca Fancelli considered himself executor of Lodovico's intentions in a very specific way when he wrote, on 12th August, 1462, about the decoration of the facade of the Palazzo del Podestà and remarked, "... se la I.S. Vostra avexe alltro parure puo far uno pocho di schizo..." (Doc.231). Lodovico himself promised to estimate work done and remaining to be done at Ostiglia when he wrote to Gianfrancesco de Ubertis on 31st January, 1450. He thought that he would need the services of the labourers for more than the fifteen days agreed upon, "ma non lo sapemo ancora de certo perche solamente siamo stati a desegnare el lavorero e non l'havemo possuto ben esaminare l'opera che la sera..." (Doc.62).⁶⁸⁸

At Revere, work was not done without his approval. He was not on site to attend to the work personally on 24th September, 1455, when he instructed the vicar to put in the three dead windows. At the same time, he absolved the vicar from the obligation of waiting for his own arrival in Revere: "...voressesmo che se metesseno sel se puo senza aspectare che nui ge siamo".

(Doc. 138). Lodovico, was at least an intermediary in the design process when he wrote to the vicar on 21st October, 1458 asking to be informed when a quantity of lime would have been delivered on site: "... poi le daremo aviso de quanto se hara a far per li cantiri..." (Doc. 210). Both practically and theoretically, Lodovico educated himself in architecture, and the palace at Revere was an early essay.

VIII. Conclusion

Behind the playful tone in Lodovico's identification of himself as the pupil learning his craft from the master, there was, in his attitude to building, a more mundane seriousness. In practice, he exercised considerable control over the building trade in the Mantovano - organizing it logistically and, where simple functional buildings and works of fortification were concerned, providing precise instructions. He took a careful interest in all his works, and seems seldom to have allowed work to progress until first satisfied with proposals.

In the early years of his marquisate, when the provision of adequate defences for the territory seems to have been his principal concern,⁶⁸⁹ he undertook, as well as defence works for the castle, the completion and enlargement of the palace at Revere. At the beginning of 1450, his ambition was not grandiose in an architectural-stylistic sense. It was his intention to finish the building as a towered and crenellated palace with an arcaded courtyard and probably trabeated loggias. It would have looked like other castle-palaces built in Lombardy. When intent upon building a new hospital in Mantua in 1449, he turned, like his contemporaries in northern Italy, to Florence for a master to design it. That master carried with him a stylistic vocabulary that satisfied Lodovico as classicizing. Lodovico may originally have intended to consult the same master about the needs of his palace at Revere. But, since there is no reason to believe that he was profoundly

dissatisfied with the first proposals for the palace, it is more likely that, having seen and admired plans for the hospital, he decided, in 1450, to have the master suggest improvements at Revere. An improved courtyard design was offered. It involved changes on piano nobile level, and especially the creation of a salone. The classicizing details, worked over a period of some years from 1451 to 1458 by a young Florentine stone-carver, probably following the designs of another Florentine, confirmed Lodovico in his admiration of the ancient style. But neither the carver nor Lodovico, himself, thought it necessary to abandon the general silhouette of the design that existed before the arrival on site of the courtyard designer in 1450. The castellated design, that, in his treatise, Filarete made subservient to classicizing detail, survived more or less intact at Revere at the expense of the all'antica aspect of the building. During this period, Lodovico was acquiring a more developed knowledge of classicizing architectural decoration.

The antique garb in which he had his palace dressed had for him, in the 1450s, no precise functional or pseudo-functional implications. Its various parts were additions to a structure that could exist without them: they were related not in any rigid architectonic framework, but, instead, rather loosely. As something non-functional or pseudo-functional, the garb did not have any precise symbolic and, therefore, rhetorical significance. (The richness and grandeur of the front door, for example, were, at this time, non-specific typological

characteristics. Probably, as far as Lodovico was concerned, those qualities might have informed the same door on any building). Viewed typologically, though, and especially as a castle-palace, Revere was the outcome of specific intentions, consistent with Lodovico's public posture, describable in terms like Cardinal Roteno's. Insofar as the palace may be described in terms of its stone-carved details, it was not a public building but a private building. As such it was a personal indulgence of Lodovico and it expresses his enthusiasm for these details. The adoption of the style was publicly praise-worthy only among the members of a group of wealthy patrons, literati, and craftsmen working in the style. Patronizing the style, almost disinterestedly, was noble in itself and probably encouraged Lodovico to further his practical and archeological education, and maintain his involvement with his projects. However, the limited and partial nature of the classical revival that the palace represents suggests that Lodovico's understanding of the style was not profound. The style of the details did not carry implications or imperatives for the basic structure to which they were applied, but fulfilled their purpose in isolation. That purpose cannot have been primarily formal-aesthetic for then they would have been bound together more tightly in an architectonic scheme.

 Their purpose seems to have been to serve the life of the imagination, rather as Filarete's treatise was. Such a view is suggested by consideration of the origins of Lodovico's taste in the works of his father's time and of the objects of his

approval later, in the works of Mantegna, and also of Alberti after 1459. Both Pisanello and Mantegna created attractive substitutes for the real world. In those worlds, people are not subjects of powerful emotion - in which case, the painted, fictive action occupies the space and the emotional vacuum of the viewer - but are grave and distant, so that the viewer's imagination may safely penetrate their space to investigate their world. Architecture that could as well exist pictorially makes, in its relative passivity, similar provision for the life of the imagination, and the palace at Revere seems to have done just that.

Of course, a building that really exists, if it is not a folly, is also the scene of more mundane activity. Revere's palace fulfilled quite practical purposes as a residential palace, a guest house, focus of administrative control of a town and a region, symbolic keep of a stronghold guarding a river-crossing and of a control-point on a waterway. Perhaps Lodovico, conscious of these functions, tried to 'get too many eggs into one basket' and ended up with a rather addled mixture. The provision that the building's details made for the life of the imagination must have failed to achieve its full effect if other aspects and details carried understandable allusions to its practical functions. For example, if the towers were readily understood as symbols of power and strength and therefore had a contemporary validity as is likely, they could not participate but would, rather, jarr with the classicizing details which alluded to the civilised life of times past - a civilised life

different from that of the chivalric legend.

The palace takes no account of Alberti's instruction in De Re, insofar as the argument is developed for a formal aesthetic. At first, it is difficult to understand how Alberti and Lodovico could have agreed on very much. But Lodovico, while building the palace, was still immature in his architectural thought. He learned much more about the ancient style and its practice, and if S. Andrea is anything to go by, he must have come to an understanding that the style had ramifications for all parts of architectural structures. Then, Alberti's buildings - particularly S. Sebastiano and S. Andrea - are perhaps not what the reader of De Re would expect from its writer.⁶⁹⁰ They look too Roman. The material immediacy of the building tends to obscure what, for Alberti, was the true generative element in classical architecture - the abstract lines of the design. It is as if Alberti, having satisfied himself that the Romans followed nature's method in creating her objects, felt justified in using archaeology - material remains - as the basis of his study of architecture, rather than, as De Re would have obliged him to do, imitate the Romans in the sense that, as builders, they imitated creative nature. Admittedly, the imitation of creative nature is not easy. If such was Alberti's approach, it would recommend itself readily to someone like Lodovico Gonzaga who, it seems, sought a return to and a revival of the period of greatness of the ancient world specifically, rather than the retrieval of its methods and practice, and the creation of a new and different Golden Age.

NOTES.

Chapter I.

1. L.B. Alberti, L'Architettura, a cura di R. Bonelli e P. Portoghesi, Milano, 1966, Prologue, pp.6-17.
2. Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi), Historiam Urbis Mantuae Gonziacaeque Familiae, in Thesaurus Antiquitatum et Historiarum Italiae Transpadanae et Alpibus Vicinae, a cura di J. Graevius, Vol.IV, Pt.II, Lugduni, 1722, p.201: "Lodovicus igitur finito bello (after the death of Nicholas V) ad opera pacis conversus, et urbem aedificiis publicis ac privatis, et agros cultura ad amoenitatem et voluptatem ornare instituit."
3. Lodovico served several masters as a mercenary captain. For example, in 1447, he quit the service of the ruler of Milan, Filippo Maria Visconti, who had declared Francesco Sforza his open enemy. Lodovico became captain-general of the Veneto-Florentine forces. His stipend was only 600 ducats per month, compared with 1.000 ducats from Milan (See, L. Mazzoldi, Mantova, La Storia, Vol.II, Mantova, 1961 (with preface by M. Bendiscioli), p.6.). This was effectively a bloodless surrender, for Sforza had the ascendancy at the time. Filippo Maria died in August 1447, when the soldiers of the League were moving against him. Lodovico had reason to respect Sforza's ability. While he was in the service of Milan, the Visconti force encountered Sforza near Casalmaggiore on 28th

September 1446. Lodovico anticipated the failure of Filippo Maria and opened negotiations with the enemy (Mazzoldi, loc. cit.). After the armistice between the Ambrosian Republic (created after the death of Filippo Maria) and the Veneto-Florentine League, Sforza occupied Pavia and declared himself count. He proceeded, through late 1447 and spring and summer of 1448 to occupy other towns. Near Caravaggio, he encountered Lodovico Gonzaga. Lodovico was slightly wounded in a skirmish, on 14th August (Mazzoldi, p.8). In a battle fought on 15th September 1448, Sforza was successful and Lodovico escaped. The latter wrote to his wife, Barbara of Brandenburg, "Salvi de la persona, de la roba neti como uno bacil da barbiero." (Mazzoldi, loc.cit., and note 21). After Sforza did make himself lord of Milan, on 26th March 1450, Lodovico received his condotta (Mazzoldi, p.11).

4. Mazzoldi, p.12.

5. L.B. Alberti, Della Famiglia, in Opere Volgari, a cura di C. Grayson, Vol.I, Bari, 1960, Bk.I.

6. Platina, 1722, p.201.

7. Mazzoldi, p.33.

8. A. Magnaguti, Studi Intorno alla Zecca di Mantova, Milano, 1913, p.14.

9. Magnaguti, 1913, p.18.

10. A. Possevino, Historia de Familia Gonzaga, Mantua, MDCXXVIII, pp.605-6.
11. Mazzoldi, pp.32-3.
12. Mazzoldi, p.32.
13. W. Braghirolli, "Luca Fancelli, scultore, architetto e idraulico del secolo XV", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Vol.III, Fasc. IV, 1876, p.616, note 19. Braghirolli gave the year 1464. C. Brown ("Luca Fancelli in Mantua -a checklist of his 185 letters to the Gonzaga with an appendix on the dating of letters regarding Luca Fancelli and Giovanni Bellini", Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Instituts in Florenz, Band XVI, Heft 2, 1972, pp.153-66, checklist.) dates the letter to 1463.
14. Mazzoldi, loc.cit.
15. After the council of 1459, wrote Platina, "Lodovicus ... totus ad ornandum civitatem convertitur; stratis duobus foris, plateis ac viis lateribus et filice; reflectis item publicis aedibus, ubi et Praetor nunc habitat, et jura civibus redduntur, arbitratus hanc impensam et ad salubritatem civitatis, et ad ornantum pertinere, simo, coene, fordibus, quibus obruebatur inficiebaturque, tandem purgatae."(Platina, 1722, p.204). Such provisions could be described as 'chronic'. But Lodovico's interventions were also 'acute', during times of natural disaster. Mazzoldi (p.34, note 110) refers the

reader to some letters in which Lodovico issued instructions on such occasions.

16. See above, notes 2 and 15.

17. Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini), Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae temporibus suis contingerunt, a J. Gobellino ... compositi..., Romae, 1584. Pius gave a brief account of Lodovico's character and accomplishments. He wrote, "Ex his ortus est Lodovicus, qui per tempora Pij Papae huic urbe praefuit, armorum et litterarum peritia clarus: nam et parentis gloriam militatis adaequavit: et Victorinum oratorem audiens, praeceptoris propemodum doctrinam assecutus est, mitis ingenij, et iustitiae observantissimus." (p.105).

18. Platina (1722, p.186) wrote, "...quattuor reliquit (Gian Francesco) filios, a Victorino Feltrensi, viro optimo atque doctissimo, et qui socraticum ingenium redolebat, moribus ac disciplina tum Graeca tum Latina imbutos." See also, Platina, Vita di Vittorino da Feltre, a cura di G. Biasuz, Padova, 1948.

19. E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.II, Mantova, 1961 (with preface by L. Caretti), p.5ff.

20. Platina (1948, p.11) wrote that Vittorino believed that forming the character of a good prince was also providing for the good of his subjects: "...comunis (ut ipse dicebat (i.e. Ognibene da Lonigo)) utilitatis causa, quod et principem optimum formans, populis, quibus is esset imperaturus, bene

consuleret, quum ad eorum mores et instituta se accomodent quos viderint in magistratibus et imperio praeesse..."

21. W. Harrison Woodward, Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators, Cambridge, 1897, p.242.
22. E. Garin, La Cultura Filosofica del Rinascimento Italiano, Firenze, 1961, p.408.
23. Giovanni Andrea de' Bussi observed that Vittorino was to be venerated for this reason. See, Faccioli, 1962, p.23.
24. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di uomini illustri del secolo XV, a cura di P. d'Ancona e E. Aeschlimann, Milano, 1951, pp.191-226.
25. That is the implication that may be taken from the remarks of Vasari about Mantegna's work in the chapel. He wrote, "...quel signore (Lodovico) ... gli fece dipignere nel castello di Mantova, per la cappella, una tavoletta, nella quale sono storie di figure non molto grande, ma bellissime."
(Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari, con nuove annotazioni e commenti Gaetano Milanesi, Firenze, 1973 (Reprint of 1906 Edition), Vol.III, pp.396-7.
26. A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Filelfo e l'umanesimo alle corti dei Gonzaga", Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XVI, 1890, p.172-3, footnote.

27. A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Platina e i Gonzaga", Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XIII, 1889, pp.430-2.
28. ibid., and Luzio & Renier, 1890, pp.153-54.
29. Luzio & Renier, 1890, p.160.
30. Luzio & Renier, 1890, p.174, 5th February 1464.
31. U. Rossi, "Cristoforo Geremia", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, 1888, pp.408-9. The Pope, of course, had issued a bull prohibiting the export of Roman antiquities on 28th April 1462 (See, for example, R. Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, Oxford, 1969, p.99.).
32. Filarete (Antonio Averlino), Filarete's Treatise on Architecture, Trans. J. Spencer, Yale, 1965, f.59r.(Facsimile).
Filarete wrote that the ancient style was best, "Et chevero sia che cittadini privati che faccino fare o casa o chiesa tutti ac quella usanza corrono intragli altri una casa fatta in via contrada nuovamente la quale via si chiama la vignia tutta la facciata dinanzi composta di pietre lavorate et tutta fatta al modo antico sicche conforto ciascheduno chenvistichi et cerchi nello hedificare il modo antico di fare et husare questi modi che senon fusse piu bello et piu hutile a firenze non fuserebbe come o detto di sopra ne anche il Signore di mantova il quale e intendentissimo non l'userebbe senon fusse quello dico et che sia vero una casa chelli

a fatta fare a uno suo castello insu po la quale ne da testimonianza."

33. See below, Chapter IV, note 215, where part of the text of this letter is given.

34. W. Braghirolli, "Leon Battista Alberti a Mantova. Documenti e Notizie Inedite", Archivio Storico Italiano, Ser.II, Vol. IX, Pt.I, 1869, p.14. See also below, Chapter VII, note 676, for the text of the letter.

35. On 20th September 1477, Lodovico wrote, of Fancelli, "...non gli è altro che la (the S. Andrea project) intende che lui." See, E. Marani, Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.II, Mantova, 1961 (with preface by E. Arslan), p.85, note 110. (Hereafter in notes, this book will be referred to under only Marani's name.).

36. Regarding the fate of other residences, see, E. Marani, "Gli edifici padronali della campagna mantovana", in Palazzi e Ville del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, pp.3-6.

Chapter II.

37. A. Bertolotti (I Comuni e le Parrocchie della Provincia Mantovana, Mantova, 1895, p.148) quoted L. Sissa, who reported that, at Trivellino, near Revere, there was dug up "una figulina" with the inscription, "T. SERTORIO. F." In 1872, three Roman sepulchre urns were found.
38. Bertolotti, op.cit., p.149.
See, Platina, 1722, p.25.
39. C. d'Arco (Studi Intorno al Municipio di Mantova, Mantova, 1871-74, Vol.III (1872), p.232) noted the significant fact that the road, constructed from 799, the "via Claudia Augusta", coming from the south bank of the Danube, ended at Ostiglia.
40. F. Amadei, Cronaca Universale della Città di Mantova, Ed. G. Amadei, E. Marani, G. Pratico, Mantova, 1954-57, Vol.I (1954), p.277.
41. Archivio di Stato di Mantova, Archivio Gonzaga (A.S.M.A.G.), Busta 21, n.1, shows that Revere, along with Volta and Goito, was pawned to Venice in 1354. The documents are headed, "Consegna al Dominio Veneto della Volta, Goito e Revere fatta dai SS.^{ri} Gonzaga per assicurazione del credito di Can Grande della Scala." (P. Torelli, L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, Ostiglia, 1920, Vol.I, p.11).
42. G. Coniglio, Mantova, La Storia, Mantova, 1958, Vol.I (with preface by L. Bulferetti), p.407, note 196 and p.381.

43. Coniglio, op.cit., p.375.

Ugolino, Guido's son, wrote, on 14th May 1359, "Tempore quo per magnificos dominos Mediolani seu eorum gentes fuit invasum et occupatum Serrarium Mantuani districtus dederint in custodiam illustris domino Aldovrandino Marchioni Estensi castra Reveri et Sermidas et ipsorum castrorum fortilicias ... pro securitate et loco pigneris certe quantitatis pecunie." (Coniglio, p.405, note 172).

44. Coniglio, op.cit., pp.379-81 and p.406, note 191.

45. See, A.S.M.A.G., Busta 21, n.6.

46. S. Mostiola was begun in 1084, according to F. Amadei (op.cit., Vol.I, p.220). V. Matteucci, Le chiese artistiche del mantovano, Mantova, 1902, p.289) dated its building to 1082.

47. The monastery of S. Lodovico Re di Francia was begun in 1452. See Documents 110, 111, 115, 116, and Amadei, op.cit., Vol.II, p.72. See also, Bullarium Francescanum ... ad tres ordines S.P.N. Francisci spectantia, N.S., Vol.I, Quaracchi, 1929, p.799. The Bull was of 4th July 1452. An account of the founding of the monastery is also given by L. Waddingus, Annales Minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco institutorum, Vol.XII, Quaracchi, 1932, p.179, no.154, Para.LVIII.

48. A Franciscan friar, Alfonso da Brigano, in about 1769, wrote about Revere's aspect: "...come dicesi cominciava da quel rimasuglio di torre per conto ora a casa Gonzaga nell'entrare

in Revere e si stendeva sina a S. Mostiola e sino a Castel Bresciano ora casa dal Checoni e Frigeri..."("Memorie Storiche del Paese di Revere, manoscritto autografo di Fr. Alfonso da Brigano sacerdote a conf. Min. Riforma nel conv. di S. Lodovico." In "Documenti Tamassia", A.S.M., Busta 3, Chap.3, p.2.).

49. Platina (Historia Inclitae Urbis Mantuae et Serenissime Familiae Gonzagae, Vienna, 1685, p.196) wrote of Lodovico's building works. But he did not mention Revere: "Tum Lodovicus liberum dominatum adeptus, ad ornandum muniendamque urbem convertitur. Anno enim septuagesimo supra trecentesium et millesimum, et curiam in eam formam, augustam quidem et amplam, aedificavit, quam adhuc cernimus, et duo suburbia, Divi scilicet Georgij et Portus, duobus continuis annis muro circumdedit."
50. Fourteenth century documents seem to confirm the suggestion. Filippino wrote on 3rd October that "...opus muri Reveri inceptum est a latere fornacis"(Doc.12), and, on 13th October, seems to have been referring to the same work when he mentioned building "...castrum a parte anteriorem."(Doc.13). The barbican which "...inceptu fuit sodari"(Doc.14) when Filippino wrote on 16th October was surely associated with the "...murum barbachani incepti ad introitum castris Reveris" mentioned on the following day and finished "...usque ad padinum po(n)tis levatoris"(Doc.15). Because of the short intervals between the writing of the letters, it seems reasonable to

suppose that the barbican was associated with work "a parte anteriorem." It is the probable location of the furnace on the river, where clay is dredged and manhandling of the raw materials and finished products to and from transport boats is not over long distances, that makes it seem likely that the entrance to the castle and the anterior part were towards the river, to the north or northeast.

51. P. Litta, Famiglie Celebri di Italia, Ser.I^a, Vol.III, Tav. III, Milano, 1843.

52. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2383.

53. Beams ordered in 1454 (Doc.125) were to be 10br" by 9br" in section. Two groups were required for each space -the second "per fare coverte de dicti legni"(of the first groups). The total floor depth could have been 18br", 19br" or 20br". Presumably, there is a certain increase in the springing, the shorter the "intrabatura traborum".

54. The length of the Mantuan braccio is taken from the column section inscribed on the facade of the house of the architect Bertani. It is approximately 18.32 ins.(0.4653m). E. Johnson (S. Andrea in Mantua, Ph.D., 1970, New York University, University Microfilms, p.12) gives the length as 0.4636m. C. Brown ("Luca Fancelli in Mantua...", 1972) gives it as 0.4766.

The building was measured with a tape marked in feet and inches. Metric lengths have been calculated on the basis

of one inch being equal to 0.0254m. Metric measurements are shown in square brackets in Pocket Drawings 1-4.

55. The brick used in the palace at Revere is $2/3$ br. by $1/3$ br. by $1/6$ br. It measures approximately 12" by 6" by 3" (0.305m. by 0.152m. by 0.076m.). One of the statutes of the comune, rewritten on the order of Francesco Gonzaga, according to Daino (d'Arco, op.cit., Vol.II, 1872, p.14), stated, "Et massarius comunis Mantue in se retineat modulum et exemplum lapidum et cupporum"(d'Arco, op.cit., Vol.III, 1872, Lib.4, p.49).

The division of the braccio into 12 inches recommends itself because 3 and 6 are among its factors, and $1/3$ and $1/6$ (the breadth and depth of a brick) may be expressed in whole numbers of parts.

56. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.14, f.38r, n.290. To Leonello d'Este, from Revere, "...racomandogli Andrea di Schivenoya nostro dilecto cittadino."

57. Cronaca di Mantova di Andrea Schivenoglia dal M.CCCC.XIV. al M.CCCC.LXXXIV., transcribed and annotated by C. d'Arco, in Raccolta di Cronisti e Documenti Storici Lombardi Inediti, Ed. G. Muller, Milano, 1857, Vol.II, p.124.

58. Schivenoglia (op.cit., p.123) wrote, "Nota che de lano 1449 fo principiatio el muro che va dreto el Po al chastelo de Revere e per tuto questo ano fo fato per fina a mezo e fo comenzata la prima preda a metere in tera fo de sopra Mantoa

e sempre ge stete sopra lo marchexo ai muradori per fina
che forse avia messe a opera mezo miara di predi e questo
luij ge stava, per che el ge mise con li soi j mane tre ducati
doro e un mezo duchato doro et moltij altre monete de ariente
cha valia in tuto 3 bon duchati."

59. Filarete's Treatise on Architecture, Trans. J. Spencer,
Yale, 1965, f.59r. Spencer (p.102) identifies the un-named
house with the palace at Revere. There can be very little
doubt that his identification is correct. Revere was the
only place on the Po where extensive works on a domestic
building were carried out in the 1450s and early 1460s. The
treatise may be dated to c.1462-64 (See, for example, Spencer,
pp.174-5, notes 13 & 14; Filarete, Trattato di Architettura,
a cura di R. Bonelli & P. Portoghesi (Testo, A. Finoli & L.
Grassi, Introd. e note, L. Grassi), Milano, 1972, pp.x-xii).
60. L. Sissa, "Notizie Storiche di Revere", in Brizeghel, Un
collezione di luoghi notevoli della provincia di Mantova,
Venezia, c.1853, commentary to Tav.XVII.
61. The wing-dividing wall only abuts the towers under the roof.
62. C. Nigra (Torri, castelli e case forti del Piemonte dal
1000 al secolo XVI^o, Novara, 1937, Vol.I, pp.10-11) wrote of
"caditoie merlate che solo in questo secolo (14th) vengano
in uso per la difesa verticale." The machicolations at
Revere are probably of the 14th century. See also, C.

Calzecchi Onesti (Il Castello Visconteo di Pavia, Roma, 1934, pp.38-44) who believed that machicolations were devices that achieved popularity only after the mid 14th century.

63. G. Giovannetti Mola (Il Marchese Marsilio Giovannetti di S. Raphaelle stratega del secolo XVII nel Palazzo Ducale di Revere e nel Monferrato, Ostiglia, 1958) wrote that the remains of the outer defense works stood until 1850. See also, E. Boriani (Castelli e Torri dei Gonzaga nel Territorio Mantovano, Brescia, 1969, p.133.).

The vestiges of the moat to the south of the palace were visible until more recently, according to local recollection.

64. The walls and wings of the palace will be referred to conventionally as North, South, East and West -the principal facade facing towards the river being called the 'North' facade.

65. See, A. Luzio, L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, Vol.II, Verona, 1922, p.365.

66. Document 52, of 17th July 1447, refers to the "reparatione del castello" of Revere needing to be done. However, the disrepair need not have been considerable. See also, Docs. 130, 238.

67. Another vertical seam that may be of significance is to be seen to the left of the mezzanine window, second from the west edge of the facade, and the door below (Fig.16). It

starts about six feet from the ground, and consists of headers. There is no sign of those narrow bricks that serve as framing mouldings for bevel-recessed windows. The seam is difficult to interpret: it is not possible to say whether the wall to left or right was prior. Therefore, it is not possible to associate the seam with a specific earlier phase of construction.

68. Marani's plan (Fig.17) appears fairly accurate, but it should be compared with the measured ground plan (Pocket Drawing 1). Some discrepancy in the number of windows, for example, may be seen.

69. See above, note 58.

70. d'Arco, Studi Intorno al Municipio..., Vol.III, Rub.13 (of the statutes of the comune), p.227. "De uno aggere in territorio Nubolarii et Riveroni. -Et quelibet persona tam ecclesiastica quam secularis illum aggerem fieri paciatur super suum territorium et quam possessionem sicut fiunt alii aggeres insule Reveris qui agger fiat expensis omnium habentium possessiones inter scepta dicti aggeris et expensis ipsarum possessionum pro numero bibulcarum." Maintenance of dycks was a continuous obligation.

71. It should be noted that the castle of Ostiglia was originally built by the Veronesi against Revere, the property of the

Mantuanans. Francesco Gonzaga bought Ostiglia from the Visconti of Milan for 20.000 ducats in 1391. See, B. Bresciani, Castelli Veronesi, Verona, 1962, pp.101-2 and p.104; S. Gionta, Fioretto delle Cronache di Mantova, Verona, 1576, pp.16-19; A. Bertolotti, I Comuni ... della provincia mantovana, Mantova, 1893, p.199. Bresciani gives a history of the castle at Ostiglia and notes, of Ponte-Molino, that it was an obligatory crossing point on the "via Claudia Augusta".(p.109).

72. In the event of war, Lodovico, under the terms of his condotta of 1466 with Milan, was to occupy Vicenza, Verona and Lonato. L. Mazzoldi (1961, p.25) wrote of "il vecchio sogno dei Gonzaga" to occupy Verona. G. Coniglio (1958, pp.450-53) chronicled Gian Francesco's military reverses as he directed his attentions towards Verona after 1438 (when he took a contract with the Visconti instead of Venice).

73. A. Cassi Ramelli, "Scaccheri Fortificati Italiani", Castellum, Roma (Castel S. Angelo), 3, 1966, pp.18-24.

74. Platina, 1685, p.437.

75. ibid., p.344.

76. See, Mazzoldi (1961, p.393) for a list of places, including Revere, where duty had to be paid on goods. P. Carpeggiani ("Luca Fancelli, architetto civile nel contado gonzaghese", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971, pp.37-44) notes the fact.

See also, the letters of 25th July 1447 (Doc.53) and 6th July 1452 (Doc.116).

77. F. Amadei (op.cit., Vol.II, pp.63-4) wrote, "...per agevolare il concorso degli operai e l'abbondanza de' materiali bisogn-evoli, dispensó per questo il paese de vari dazi e gabelle che diconsi 'traversie' del Po. Sopra del quale si cominció a piantare un porto con due barche grosse per maggior comodo de' passeggeri."
78. d'Arco (Studi Intorno al Municipio..., Vol.VII, pp.174-5, n.89) published an investiture of 7th March 1332: "...insula Reveri propter diluvia et inundationes aquarum et quasi ad sterilitatem deducta." Therefore it is required "...ut aggeres dictae insulae ipsi vassali de novo faciant et effectualiter reficiant." A statute of the comune (published by d'Arco, op.cit., Vol.III, pp.100-1, Lib.5, Rub.21.) also encouraged foreigners to settle. "De alieno districtu:- Quicumque de alieno districtu Mantue causa laborandi terras et possessiones de cetero venerit habitare habeat immunitatem a Comuni Mantue et sit liber ab omnibus oneribus et factionibus Communis Mantue tam civitatis quam districtus realibus et personalibus et cujuscumque generis usque ad decem annos." Alberti expressed a common attitude when he wrote, in De Re', "...insigne urbis ornamentum extare, ubi sit civium copia."(L'Architettura, a cura di R. Bonelli e P. Portoghesi, Milano, 1966, Vol.II, VIII, 1, p.533.

79. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 271-2, 30th August 1453.

80. F. Biondo, Roma Ristaurata et Italia Illustrata di Biondo da Forlì. Tradotte in buona lingua volgare per Luciano Fauno, Venezia, 1542, p.152: "Dopo di Sermedo in Riva di Po è Revere, nova terra posta al rimpetto di Ostiglia, e Lodovico Gonzaga marchese di Mantoa l'ha di forte mura circondata, e se ingegna d'ornarla d'un bellissimo palazzo."

Chapter III.

81. The Commentaries of Pius II, Trans. F. Gragg, Ed. L. Gabel, Smith College Studies in History, Northampton, Mass., Vol. XXV, nos.1-4, Oct.1939 - July 1940, Bk.II, p.184; Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae temporibus suis contingerunt, a J. Gobellino ... compositi..., Romae, 1584, p.104: "Secuta nox Roverij peracta est, quo in loco palatium semiaedificatum, structura et artificio singulare architecti ostendit ingenium."
82. F. Biondo, See above, Chapter II, note 80.
83. L. Sissa (Brizeghel, op.cit., commentary to Tav.XVII), for example, wrote that the furnishings of the chapel were removed, and that its door-surround now decorates one of the accesses to the principal staircases at the ends of the north loggia. The other door-surround came from the vestibule of the Sala. The staircases, themselves, are later additions.
84. A. Bertolotti (Architetti, Ingegneri e Matematici in relazione coi Gonzaga ... nei secoli XV, XVI, XVII, Genova, 1889, p.34) wrote that Domenico 'soprastante', who had been sent to Rome to learn about architecture in 1532 and who, on his return to Mantua, worked with Giulio Romano, worked at the palace at Revere, in March 1546. G. Giovannetti Mola (op.cit., p.20) wrote, "Marsilio Giovannetti, con storico intuizione sulla posizione strategica e grande preparazione

militare, provide come prima cosa a munire il castello di Revere, Palazzo Ducale Gonzaghesco, quale punto fondamentale, base, rocca forte e piazza militare del sistema difensivo mantovano."

85. A plaque on its eastern side bears the inscription, "RIPERIENSIS ANNO MDCCLV/ REGNANTE MARIA THERESA ROMANORUM IMPERATRICE/ VETUSTATE COLLABENTEM REFECERUNT." Giovannetti Mola (op.cit., p.125) wrote that work was done on the palace at the same time.

86. V. Montanara, "Il Fancelliano Palazzo Ducale di Revere sta Ritornando ai suoi Antichi Splendori", Gazetta di Mantova, 15th May 1970, p.6.

87. V. Montanara, "Storia e Leggende dei Castelli Mantovani - Revere", Rivista Bimestrale della Camera di Commercio di Mantova, n.34, Sett.-Ott., 1971, pp.118-24.

88. Montanara, 1970.

To this time may be dated the closing of two of the small windows at crenellation level (Compare Figures 23 and 36.). The present windows have been refurbished. The framed window at the top of the east tower (on the facade) had been bricked up (See, Figure 1 in P. Carpeggiani, Il Palazzo Gonzaghesco di Revere, Mantova, 1974), but is now opened.

89. G. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito d'Artisti dei secoli XIV, XV, XVI, Vol.I, 1326-1500, Firenze, 1839, p.233, Doc.XCIV,

23rd March 1471. Recommending new plans for the church's east end, Giovanni wrote, "...le quali tucte cose appariranno per la V. Ill. S. de' fondamenti essere erecte, e non si dira quella in sulla fabrica da altri principiata havere edificato."

90. Vespasiano da Bisticci (Vite di uomini illustri del secolo XV, 1951, p.416) wrote, "Fece (Cosimo de' Medici) murare il palagio di Firenze da' fondamenti."

C. Ricci (Il Tempio Malatestiano, Milano/Roma, 1925, pp.14-5) noted the inscription on a plaque affixed to the castle at Rimini, documenting Sigismondo's activity: "...ex fundamentis erexit construxitque."

Alberti, however, wrote, in De Re', "I am for preserving the old structures untouched, till such time as it is absolutely necessary to remove them to make way for the new." (Ten Books on Architecture, Trans. J. Leoni, Ed. J. Rykwert, London, 1965 (Reprint of 1755 Edition), III, 1.). "Itaque pristina velim serves integra, quoad nova illis demollitis attolli nequeant." (L'Architettura, 1966, p.177.).

91. See, for example, S. Davari, "I Palazzi del Antico Comune di Mantova e gli Incendi da Essi Subiti", Estratto di Atti della R. Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, Mantova, 1888, p.13.

92. See above, Chapter II, note 45.

93. The same window type is found, for example, in the later

15th century houses of Osanna Andreasi (Fig.25) and Mantegna. Definite early examples are not found so frequently. Recessed windows without the moulding are to be seen on the restored ground floor facade of the Palazzo del Capitano in Mantua. There are no signs of these mouldings round the windows of the house at n.10, via Fratelli Bandiera (Fig.26). There, however, they may have been chipped off, as at Revere on the west facade, and intonaco may cover their traces.

94. Four thousand nails were required to fix "cantinelli" -laths perhaps, such as those that, in ceiling construction, run parallel with the beams at right angles to the joists and hide the edges of planks, supported by the joists.
95. See above, Chapter II, note 58.
96. Filarete/Spencer, f.59r., "...il Signore di mantova il quale e intendentissimo..." f.99v., "...questo a me pareva uno huomo intendentissimo in piu cose; maxime in hedificare pareva che ancora lui n'avesse sommo piacere; dimostro essere intendentissimo molto in queste cose dello hedificare." See note 13, p.174 of translation volume.
97. See above, Chapter I, note 32.
98. Paccagnini believed that the pictures were painted between the years 1447 to 1449 and 1450/1 to 1455 (G. Paccagnini, "Il Ritrovamento del Pisanello nel Palazzo Ducale di Mantova",

Bollettino d'Arte, Ser.V, Anno LII, I, 1967, pp.17-19;
Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Torino, 1969; Pisanello e il
Ciclo Cavalleresco di Mantova, Venezia, 1972; Pisanello alla
corte dei Gonzaga, Mantova, Palazzo Ducale, a cura di G.
Paccagnini con la collaborazione di M. Figlioli, Venezia,
1972 (Exhibition Catalogue); Pisanello, Trans. J. Carroll,
Phaidon, 1973.). Zanolì, on the basis of stylistic analysis
and evidence of a dispute between Pisanello and Lodovico
Gonzaga before October 1442, dates the work to Gian Francesco's
time (A. Zanolì, "Sugli Affreschi del Pisanello nel Palazzo
Ducale di Mantova", Paragone, 277, March 1973, pp.23-44).
However, Pisanello made the medal of Lodovico as captain-
general of the troops of the Veneto-Florentine League in 1447
(Fig.27). Maria Fossi-Todorow, abandoning her previous
suggestion that sketchbook drawings 2594 and 2595 (See, M. Fossi-
Todorow, I Disegni del Pisanello e della sua Cerchia, Firenze,
MCMLXVI, Tav.LXXVIII and LXXIX, Catalogue nos.65, 66, pp.83-5)
were preparatory to work of this decorative scheme, dates
it to Lodovico's time on account of a stylistic development
that she sees from the S. Anastasia frescoes.(M. Fossi-Todorow,
"Pisanello at the court of the Gonzaga at Mantua", Burlington
Magazine, Vol.CXIV, 1972, pp.888-91.). Ilaria Toesca favour-
ed the suggestion that the Sala del Pisanello was painted
during Gian Francesco's marquisate and offered a terminus
post quem in 1436, when Henry IV of England conferred on
Gian Francesco the right to award to fifty of his favourites
the device of the chain of the 'S's' with the swan. The
devices appear in the decorative frieze of the battle picture.

(I. Toesca, "Lancaster e Gonzaga: Il freggio della 'Sala del Pisanello' nel Palazzo Ducale di Mantova", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno VII, Quad.42, 1973, pp.361ff; I. Toesca, "A Frieze by Pisanello", Burlington Magazine, Vol.CXVI, 1974, pp.210-14.). They also appear in the painting itself. Toesca has more recently discovered that the livery was in the possession of Gian Francesco by 1416. Consequently, 1436 is no longer such an acceptable terminus post quem, and, that being so, the pictures may with less confidence be dated to Gian Francesco's period.(I. Toesca, "More about the Pisanello murals at Mantua", Burlington Magazine, Vol.CXVIII, 1976, pp.622-29.). Baxendall favours the 1438-42 dating, believing that Lodovico would have wanted something more 'humanus'. (M. Baxendall, Review of "Pisanello" by G. Paccagnini, Art Bulletin, Vol.57, 1975, pp.130-31.). However, such an argument supposes a very sharp break between the values of Lodovico and Gian Francesco. But it was Gian Francesco who employed Vittorino da Feltre and received Alberti's dedication of De Pictura. Filarete, in the Trattati, maintained that there was no such sudden break with tradition. The history of construction of the palace at Revere will indicate the same thing. Baxendall notes the possible existence in the decoration of the 'sun-flower', Lodovico's device. (Zanoli had denied that the device was to be found.). None of the arguments is beyond dispute, and another similarly disputable one may be offered. Two ladies, under the pavilion on the short stretch of wall left of the Battle, have rather deliberately-painted heraldic flowers on their

shoulders. With four petals, they resemble poppies rather than roses, and seem to be devices (Fig.28). A similar device is to be found on a roof boss, from the church of S. Francesco in Mantua (Fig.29). It is pendant to another, bearing a sun's face in a sunburst (Fig.30). (For an account of the Gonzagas' relations with S. Francesco, see. A. Patricolo, "La Chiesa di S. Francesco d'Assisi a Mantova dei Minori Osservanti", Rassegna d'Arte, Anno XI, 1911, pp.33-36 and pp.53-59.). A fresco fragment resembling the boss with the flower is dateable to 1448 (See, Paccagnini's note accompanying Figure 15, in the exhibition catalogue.). The flower also appears in Pisanello's medal of Lodovico (Fig. 27). However, although the use of this device appears to support arguments for a late dating of the decoration, another motif -the 'sunflower' of the Battle frieze (Fig.31)- that seems, at first, to suggest a link between Lodovico and the commission, was used over such a long period as to be useless for dating purposes. The same may be the case with the first flower motif. The 'sunflower' also appears in the "guarden les forces" drawing in Pisanello's sketchbook (Fig. 32) and in a stone-carved roundel carrying the arms of Bohemia (Fig.33), in the Palazzo Ducale. The shield contained in the quattrofoil covers the intersection of the stems of three flowers similar to those in the frieze and in Pisanello's drawing. The roundel is pendant to another (Fig. 34) that, similarly bears the arms of Bohemia and carries the initials of Gian Francesco Gonzaga. Both probably date, to the years before 1433, when the Imperial eagles were

added to the Gonzaga arms. So, the dating of Pisanello's paintings remain open to discussion. It should be noted that the 'sunflower' is not correctly named. It does resemble adonis vernalis -a kind of anemone. However, Toesca (1976) has identified it as a marigold. Marsh marigold and common marigold are called, in French, soucie. She finds reference to it and to the chain of the SSs in the inscription on the caparison of one of the horses in the Battle: SY ES LA S. MIRE I. ('Here is the S(oucie). Admire it.'). She also observes that soucie derives from solsequia. The marigold follows the sun.

Conceits referring to the sun bring Lodovico to mind (See below, Chapter VII, note 585). But, tending to rebutt an argument that Lodovico commissioned the work is the fact that, as early as about 1450, according to Davari, Lodovico directed his attention, vis à vis the palace as a whole, to the Castel di S. Giorgio, which he made his own living quarters.(S. Davari, Notizie Storiche Topografiche della Città di Mantova nei secoli XIII, XIV e XV, Mantova, 1903, p.41.). As has been seen, Pisanello was available to work for the marquis Lodovico from 1447-49 and 1451-55. The coincidence or near-coincidence of work in the old part of the palace and the Castel di S. Giorgio may seem rather unlikely.

99. See above, note 98.

100.G.Pacchioni, "Belbello da Pavia e Gerolamo da Cremona - miniatori", L'Arte, Roma, 1915, Pt.1, p.251. Barbara of

Brandenburg's letter of 10th November to Francesco Gonzaga, where, in answer to an offer to send Belbello to Mantua to finish the missal, she wrote that it would be completed by "...un zovene di questa terra el quale minia molto bene." (See, L'Arte, 1915, Pt.2, p.369, Doc.5.).

Regarding the missal, see the catalogue, Mostra Storica Nazionale della Miniatura, Palazzo di Venezia, Roma, 2nd Ed., Firenze, 1954, p.187, n.278.

101. On 5th August 1456, he made out his will. It was made out again on 16th November 1458 (L. Cittadella, Documenti ed Illustrazioni risguardanti la Storia Artistica Ferrarese, Ferrara, 1868, pp.138-9, and G. Milanesi, Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese, Siena, 1854, Vol.II, pp.293-95.). Milanesi believed that this Angelo was Angelo "Parrasio" Senese, mentioned by Cyriaco d'Ancona as one of the first Italians to use the oil-painting method and as the painter of the Muses at Belfiore in 1449. (See also, A. Venturi, Storia dell'Arte Italiana, Milano, 1914, Vol.VII/3, p.508.). Milanesi also believed Angelo to be Angelo "del Macagnino" who was imprisoned at Nocero for murder in 1439. (See, Milanesi, op.cit., docs.149 and 150, for Cardinal Vitelleschi's letters to the Sienese authorities on the subject.).

102. R. Longhi, Officina Ferrarese, Firenze, 1956, p.18. The oeuvre consists of a St. Jerome in a private collection, a portrait of a woman in the Museo Civico in Venice, a Madonna and Child with Saints in a Milan private collection and two Virtues in the Casa Strozzi in Florence.

103. G. Intra, "Donatello e il Marchese Lodovico Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.II, Vol.III, 1886, pp.665-69.
104. See above, note 100.
105. E. Marani, 1961, p.47. Lodovico wrote to him on 14th November 1458, inviting him to come to Mantua to finalise arrangements of, almost certainly, employment (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.36, f.17v. See, L. Puppi, Il Trittico di Andrea Mantegna per la Basilica di San Zeno Maggiore in Verona, Verona, 1972, Doc.VI, p.69.). He may have gone to Mantua and have been the 'Michele pentore' whose arrival in pursuit of a runaway assistant was announced to the Podestà of Verona on 8th December 1458 (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop. Lib.35, f.27v). Regarding Michele, see, A. Venturi, op.cit., pp.562-70 & Pl.431.
106. See, C. d'Arco, Delle Arti e Degli Artefici di Mantova, Mantova, 1857, Vol.I, p.38.
107. Brunelleschi's trip to Mantua to consider hydraulic engineering problems in 1445, according to Vasari, finds no other confirmation (Vasari, Milanesi, 1973 (Reprint of 1906 Edition), Vol.II, p.379).
108. Lodovico held a condotta with Filippo Maria Visconti who, in May 1446, declared war upon Francesco Sforza and attacked Cremona. Florence and Venice moved against him. Judiciously, Lodovico changed sides and joined the Veneto-

Florentine alliance. He was promised protection for a year.(See, L. Mazzoldi, 1961, p.6.).

109. See, A. Bertolotti, Figuli, Fonditori e Scultori in relazione con la corte di Mantova nei secoli XV, XVI, XVII, Milano, 1890, pp.65-6. Marani (1961, p.5 and p.48) suggests that Lorenzo was one of three brothers (Andrea, Giacomo and Lorenzo) who inscribed their names on a stone on the Ponte di S. Giorgio. d'Arco (Delle Arti e degli Artefici..., Vol. II, 1857, p.10, Doc.9) published a letter of June 1462 to Lodovico -a request for payment for stone provided for the palace at Gonzaga. The writer was probably the same Lorenzo.
110. See, d'Arco (Studi Intorno al Municipio..., Vol.III, Rub.41^a, pp.48-50) for wage rates for brick-filing in the early 15th century.
111. Lorenzo was also involved with the supply of stone, perhaps for Revere, on 5th April 1451, when the vicar of Castel Mantovano was required to supply seven carts for its transport (Doc.85).
112. Compare, for example, the arches of the cortile of the Palazzo Medici-Riccardi and those supporting the rings of the domes of the Old Sacristy of S. Lorenzo and the Pazzi Chapel.
113. E. Arslan, Venezia Gotica, Venezia, 1970, p.236ff.

114. Marani, 1961, Tav.211.
115. R. Bellodi, "La Casa di Giovanni Boniforte a Mantova", Arte Italiana Decorativa e Industriale, Vol.4, 1904;
M. Palvarini, La Casa di Giovan Boniforte da Concorezzo - una preziosa architettura del quattrocento mantovano, Mantova, 1964. Palvarini read the inscriptions containing the dates properly. Marani attributes the capitals of the portico to the workshop that produced those at Revere.
116. A. Luzio, "I Corradi di Gonzaga di Mantova", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Fasc.XXXVIII, Anno XL, Milano, 1913, pp.172-3, Doc.XXVI (from A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2093), letter of 13th April 1395.
117. F. Amadei, Cronaca Universale della Città di Mantova, Mantova, 1954, Vol.I, pp.670-71.
118. A. Luzio, op.cit., p.176. Sigismund was as gratified as, it may be imagined, Gian Francesco was. He wrote, "Sia certo che senza pagamento alchuno lo faremo marchexe de Mantova..." He insisted that he had only borrowed Gian Francesco's 10.000 ducats.
119. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 85.
120. G. Gerola ("Vecchie insegne di casa Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.V, Anno XLV, Fasc.I, 1918, pp.97-110)

wrote that although the eagles were awarded to the Gonzaga in 1403 (to be confirmed by Boniface IX in 1404), they were not adopted by the family until the confirmation of Gian Francesco as marquis in 1433 (p.108). Coniglio (1958, p.447) wrote that the investiture of 1403 had no value because Wenceslaus had no jurisdiction at the time. An unusual feature of some of the arms is the absence of the lions of Bohemia quartered with the Gonzaga bands. The bands, without the lions, are found at Revere on some of the capitals of the courtyard and on the 'old' fireplace (Fig.43,44). Pisanello drew a similar device (Fossi Todorow, 1961, Tav. LXXXIV). If a specific date were to be suggested for these arms -implying, of course, that the column capitals were carved in two groups - there may have been a political reason for the absence of the lions. They could have been carved during a period in which Mantua and Venice -its patron saint, St. Mark- were at war. Giovan Pietro Arrivabene, in Gonzagidos, wrote (in connection with the campaign of 1453, when the columns were almost certainly already carved), "Utque aquila e summo coeli demissa leonem/ Unguibus occidit: sic nos insignia bello vincemus." (in Vitae Summorum Dignitate et Eruditione Virorum..., Ed. J. Meuschen, Coburgi, MDCCXXXVIII, Vol.III, p.10). It is conceivable that people with a poetical turn of imagination would dislike the symbol almost as much as the enemy. If the capitals date to a period of enmity between Mantua and Venice, they could have been worked between 1438, when Gian Francesco lost his condotta with the Republic and the beginning of

1447, when Lodovico became captain of the troops of the Veneto-Florentine League.

121. A. Possevino, Historia de Familia Gonzaga, Mantua, MDCXXVIII, p.569. Possevino wrote that Lodovico was confirmed as marquis on 7th August 1445. Mazzoldi (1961, p.4) wrote that the investiture was made on 27th August 1445.

122. Compare, for example, the vault of the garden loggia of the Badia at Fiesole.

123. The problem of the side portico vaults cutting across old windows would not have arisen if the covered spaces had been trabeated. However, in that case, the northern row of columns of the north loggia would have been structurally superfluous. The wall above the north arcade is supported by only the south row of columns. And the beams spanning the spaces above are adequately supported by that wall. In other words, the northern row of columns serves a structural purpose only in connection with the vault. It must be a matter of doubt that real columns would be ordered for only decorative purpose.

124. Height of column from bottom of plinth to top of abacus is 12'3"(3.734m). Distance between east and west wings (under north portico) is 79'3"_c.(24.155m). Distance between wings (to south of thickened parts of walls) is 81'4"_c.(24.79m). Intercolumniation is 11'7½"_c.(3.543). The

column plinths are $2\frac{1}{4}$ "c. square (0.616m). See, Pocket Drawings 1 & 4.

125. From the back wall of the north loggia to the nearer edge of the nearer line of columns is a distance of $23\frac{1}{2}$ "c. (7.049m). The side bays, similarly measured, are $5\frac{9}{16}$ "c. deep (1.752m). See, Pocket Drawings 1 & 4.
126. That wall must be wrongly drawn on the plan of the piano nobile (Fig.55), where it appears to be four headers thick. See Pocket Drawing 1. Comparison with the Pocket Drawings 1 and 4 and Figure 56 shows that the piano nobile plan is inaccurate in its description of the fenestration around the courtyard. On the north side, the windows are in fact placed with equal distances between them. The same applies to the east and west sides -windows are separated by an intercolumniation and a half of brickwork.
127. The situation becomes complicated above the north portico. There is reason to believe that the walls that divide up that space (See above, note 126, Fig.55) were built later than the exterior walls of the piano nobile towards the courtyard -though lack of archaeological evidence makes conclusions uncertain.
- At present, there is no access from the east wing to the west wing. It must have been closed, or else walls must have been built, when the palace was converted to the uses of offices. If the demands of symmetry were insistent,

as the layout of the north part of the north wing implies (It must be regarded as likely that the two thin walls dividing the rooms 7 and 9 behind the north facade were later insertions.), a reorganization that took place must, surely, have involved either the demolition of a wall in the west, corresponding with the wall that continues the line of the east corridor, or the building of the latter wall, the walls of the small rooms 3a, 3b and 3c adjacent and perhaps also the other walls in the area above the north portico. As a later addition, the wall continuing the line of the east corridor 4 would, with the walls of the adjacent small rooms, have been part of the programme of building that involved the construction of the thin wall dividing room 7 behind the north facade -a programme that, because it separated the two halves of the building functionally at that level, was recent. Otherwise, two building programmes would have seen the construction of the wall continuing the east corridor, and the walls dividing the space 3 between the corridor and the Sala delle Udienze. That is unlikely. On the one hand, it is a complicated explanation. On the other hand, the space 3 would have been too long to be useful except perhaps as an atrium to the Sala delle Udienze, and the awkward placing of the large and noble window to that space would not have been justified. (If walls originally continued both east and west corridors, and enclosed a single large space -which would have been about 45½ br. long- the windows were squeezed very uncomfortably into the corners of the room.).

A similarly unsatisfactory space, like 3, would have been created if a wall had once continued the line of the west corridor. If a wall did exist there, access to the west corridor has probably been filled in, as has a doorway to the stairwell and a doorway into the Sala delle Udienze. If that wall, like the corresponding one to the east, ran right up to the north wing dividing wall, the partition wall of the north wing corridor 5 towards the west was built after the demolition. Perhaps it would not be necessary to have a doorway in the Sala delle Udienze. Access could have been along the north wing corridor 5. However, it is clear that the virtue of the space of the Sala would be much abused by such an arrangement (-as it is now by the existence of the corridor.). For the sake of the Sala delle Udienze to have had fitting nobility, a door would have to have been closed in the wall between room 1 and the Sala, and a part of that wall, where the corridor now is, been demolished (-there would have been no corridor between the Sala delle Udienze and the north part of the north wing. Such a wall would have served little purpose.). The north corridor wall's existence seems to be best justified in the light of the intention to turn the piano nobile into offices. It creates the room 1 which shares with the room in the west tower 6 and the room 7b the distinction of having only one door -from which may possibly be inferred the greater importance of their occupants. That corridor wall, in which the doors open rather waywardly into the Sala delle Udienze, isolates the functions of the rooms that give off it. It may, perhaps, be questioned whether a domestic complex

would have had use for such a diffuse association of separated spaces.

If it is unlikely that the east corridor-continuing wall was proposed originally, and if it is unlikely, by corollary, that the west corridor-continuing wall was demolished, it is also unlikely that the side walls of the Sala delle Udienze were built when the piano nobile was first raised. These walls run, perhaps rather precariously it may be thought, from the apices of the arches at either end of the north arcade rather than above the springing points. (If they are $1\frac{1}{3}$ br. thick, like other walls, they contain an area that is $4 \times 53\frac{1}{3}/7 - 1\frac{1}{3}$ br. long, or approximately 29 br.). Walls running east-west in the space above the north portico are clearly of a thickness that the very slight support of the vault below will allow. The fenestration of the piano nobile, towards the courtyard, is arranged in such a way that the present placing of interior walls does not justify its awkward aspect from the exterior - the extreme windows are jammed tightly into the corners of the courtyard (Fig. 56). The windows light a single space more sensibly than the present divided space. The regular placing of windows bears no relationship with the arcading. Yet the walls of the Sala delle Udienze at present follow the discipline set by the arcuation. If the walls under discussion and the placing of the windows were part of the same building programme, it would be expected that there would be an agreement between them. Rather, it would seem that the walls were built later, and that the area above the north portico

was originally conceived as a single space.

128. In the garden loggia of the Badia of Fiesole, where a double-bay depth is also found, the arcade consists of a single row of columns. The depth of the loggia is reduced and the vault is stilted, perhaps for the sake of stability. The loggia at Fiesole was built after that at Revere. On 11th October 1460, Bruoso di Benedetto and his brother, Benedetto, were credited for providing the columns of the loggia (C. von Fabriczy, Filippo Brunelleschi, sein Leben und seine Werke, Stuttgart, 1892, p.590).

At the Badia, Cosimo de' Medici's intention, according to Alberto Avogadro's De Religione et Magnificentia ... Cosmi Medici (quoted by E. Gombrich, "The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", in Italian Renaissance Studies, Ed. E. Jacob, London, 1960, p.296), was that "...the cloisters ... be vaulted and supported by twin columns, the one coloured and the companion of snow-white marble." (See also, E. Gombrich, "Alberto Avogadro's Descriptions of the Badia of Fiesole and the Villa of Careggi", Italia Medioevale e Umanistica, n.5, 1962, pp.217-29.).

129. See for example, the cloister of S. Zeno at Verona or the cloister of the Badia at Chiaravalle Milanese.

130. See for example, the facade of the narthex of S. Trinità at Verona or the apse of SS. Maria e Donato at Murano.

131. It has been noted that, under the north loggia, the side

walls are probably thickened. Half-columns, then may be conceived as hidden in those thickened stretches of wall. Two reasons may be suggested for a similar 'absorption' not occurring along the back wall. First, the doubling of columns creates an ambiguity about which line of column-axes is the true measuring point. Second, a further thickening of the back wall would have made it almost four and a half feet thick. Perhaps it was thought that such a thickening would distinguish that wall too obviously from others (-its thickness would have been visible at the entrance and where windows are opened.), and that the expenditure in bricks was not sufficiently merited by such a procedure.

132. Filarete (Filarete/Spencer, f.29r.) had Francesco Sforza observe, of his plan for the tower, that the wall would be plumb on the outside and would be diminished in thickness up the inside.

133. The side loggie have been deprived, by their placing, of usefulness at ground level. Could not the side bays have been deepened and the 3'10"c.(1.168m) of brickwork at the junctions of the arcades have been given to them? This solution would have been possible but unsatisfactory. The whole-number relationship of depths of side bays and north portico could not have been maintained. The corners would have presented a problem in that, the north vault being supported by paired columns and the side loggie

lintels resting on single columns, a disturbing, eye-catching cluster of three columns would have marked the corners. This difficulty could have been overcome by removing one of the rows of columns at the north. However, others would have been created. If the south row were used, the space under the vault would have lost its proportioning, and the widening that would have resulted might have presented a problem for the stability of the vault. If the north row were used, the northernmost half-columns of the side arcades would be found even further away from that row -but not far enough for it to be possible to fit in another interspace (-since the placing of the columns of the side arcades is fixed by the situation of the side doors.). The gap would have to have been filled in with brickwork, and all semblance of symmetry at the corners would have been lost.

134. The measured distance from the centre of the side door to the back wall of the north loggia is 72'c.(21.946m). Expressed in Mantuan braccia, that is nearly 47.2. It has been suggested (p.72) that the back wall was thickened by about 16", or 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ br". The original line could have been on the 48br. mark.

135. See above, note 133.

136. It would be possible to divide a distance less than that between the wings by seven and give the rest to corner masonry. However, a reduced intercolumniation involves a

reduction in the height of the arches and an exacerbation of the problem of the considerable height of the windows (determined by the height of the piano nobile) above the arcades. Also, the spaces above would have been narrow and the covered areas would have been ungenerous.

137. Francesco di Giorgio drew a 9 by 5 courtyard. See, Trattati di architettura, ingegneria e arte militare, a cura di C. Maltese, Transcr. by L. Maltese Degrassi, Milano, 1967, Tomo I, f.20r.(facsimile).

138. The circumference of a column shaft, above the base, is about $4'7\frac{1}{8}"(1.40m)$. That gives a diameter of $17.544"$ ($0.446m$). The upper astragal starts at about $10'3"(3.124m)$ from the bottom of the plinth. That is close to 7 shafts. The whole supporting member is rather less than $8\frac{1}{2}$ shafts high ($12'3"$ or $3.734m$). The shaft diameter does not relate to the base width by root two. The ratio is close to 5:7. The height of the base and plinth, at about $15\frac{3}{4}"(0.40m)$ does not bear any simple relationship with the shaft diameter (though it is close to $2/7$ of the shaft circumference.). Nor does it relate simply with the width of the base.

139. Perhaps interestingly, a related proportioning system is found in the annotations to Abbaco's drawing of S. Sebastiano (reproduced by G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, Roma, 1970(Reprint of 1911 Edition), p.396). The numbers 8 and $13\frac{1}{3}$ appear, but their arithmetic mean, X

$10^{2/3}$, does not. The ten measures given may be grouped in six ratios of 3:5. A proportioning system -using 3-4-5- triangles- that, it is suggested, was abandoned at Revere, was used in 1460 or after. Abbacco's drawing is accurate in its indications of lengths, according to G. Bassani, A. Galdi and A. Poltronieri ("Analisi per il restauro del tempio di San Sebastiano in Mantova", in Il Sant' Andrea di Mantova e Leon Battista Alberti, Mantova, 1974, p.243, note 3.). However, they believe that Alberti did not use the local braccio. Instead, the writers suggest that he used the one in service at Piacenza. On the other hand, R. Lamoureux converts the dimensions of the building to Mantuan braccia. Some of the measures are very close to Abbacco's: for example, the apse widths (7.97 for 8), door (7.97 x 4.76 for 8 x 4.8) and the depth of the portico (10.07 for 10). He calculates on the basis of a braccio being 0.4765m.(R. Lamoureux, Alberti's Church of San Sebastiano in Mantua, Ph.D. thesis, 1975, New York University, University Microfilms, p.15).

In De Re' (III, 1), Alberti wrote of the 3-4-5 set square used by the ancients. See also, Ludi Mathematici (Opere Volgari, a cura di C. Grayson, Vol.III, Bari, p.154). Of course, the 3-4-5 triangle has the charm of reconciling geometry and arithmetic.

140. Marani (1961, p.18, notes 68, 69) dates the cloisters to the period of Guido Gonzaga's abbacy (1431-57).

141. When arcades are turned on columns, the same independence can be achieved if the corner bays are square while the intervening ones are rectangular in plan. At Revere, for example, if 864" (the distance from the centre of the side door to the back wall of the north loggia) = $3\frac{1}{2}x + y$ (where 'x' is the intercolumniation and 'y' is the bay depth), and 976" (the distance between the side wings) = $3x + 2y$, the intercolumniation would be 188", or 15'8", and the bay depth would be 206", or 17'2".
142. W. Braghirolli ("Luca Fancelli, scultore, architetto e idraulico del secolo XV", Archivio Storico Lombardo, 1876, p.612) attributed to Fancelli, "...i più minuti dettagli di decorazione esterne ed interne delle porte, finestre e colonne."
- Thieme & Becker, Vol.II, wrote confusingly that although the building was perhaps begun before Luca's period of activity it is to be considered his work in layout and detail.
- E. Marani (1961, pp.70-71) calls the palace "...il frutto di una vitale fusione dell'educazione fancelliana con il mondo cavalleresco padano." He believes that little was finalised as far as Lodovico's building programme was concerned before Fancelli's time.
- M. Salmi ("La 'Domus Nova' dei Gonzaga", Arte, Pensiero e Cultura a Mantova nel Primo Rinascimento in Rapporto con la Toscana e con il Veneto, Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Firenze-Venezia-Mantova,

27th Sett. - 1st Ott. 1961, Firenze, pp.15-21) concentrated upon the decorative work at Revere.

C. Cottafavi (Enciclopedia Italiana dell' Istituto Treccani, Vol.XIV, 1932-40, pp.783-84), in the entry, 'Luca Fancelli', wrote, "A lui sono dovuti il castello di Revere col magnifico portale scolpito..."

G. Paccagnini (Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Torino, 1969, p.46) believes that Fancelli worked from another's designs.

P. Carpeggiani ("Luca Fancelli architetto civile nel contado gonzaghesco", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971, pp.37-44; Il Palazzo Gonzaghesco di Revere, Mantova, 1974) agrees with Marani's judgement. He wrote, "...assumendo come dato di fatto imprescindibile l'esistenza di un organismo architettonico già configurato nella sua struttura tipologica essenziale, ne intacca, tuttavia, la 'facies' per il tramite di una serie coordinata di interventi."(1974, p.43).

C. Perogalli & M. Sandri (Ville delle Province di Cremona e Mantova, Milano, 1973, p.54) wrote of the palace, "...fatto erigere da Lodovico Gonzaga a partire del 1450 ed opera sicura di Luca Fancelli."

143. W. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.XVII, pp.634-5, 10th November 1491.

144. ibid., Doc.XIX, p.637.

145. ibid., Doc.VIII, p.628.

146. ibid., Doc.V, pp.626-7, 17th December 1474, Doc.XII, pp.630-

32, 12th August 1487. See also, G. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito...,

Vol.I, p.239, note. For other information regarding Fancelli's family affairs, see, W. Braghirolli, "Notizie e Documenti Inediti intorno a Pietro Vannucci detto il Perugino", Giornale di Erudizione Artistica, Vol.II, 1875, pp.73-76. Presumably, he came to the attention of Cosimo de' Medici while working on a Medici project such as the Badia of Fiesole, S. Lorenzo or the Medici Palace in Florence. However, in view of his youth, it is unlikely that he worked in an organizational capacity. Gaye, who published letters dealing with Fancelli, revealed that he was the son of Jacopo di Bartolomeo da Settignano (op.cit., p.239). He was the brother of Bartolomeo who matriculated in the guild of Pietre e Legnami on 27th January 1462 (f.119r. A.S.F.). Jacopo, or "Papero di Meo dassetignano", was mentioned, along with Simone di Nanni da Fiesole (the father of Francesco di Simone Ferrucci) and Cipriano di Bartolo da Pistoia, by Ghiberti in his Catasto returns of 1427 and 1433: "sono miei garzoni in bottega." (R. Krautheimer, Ghiberti, Princeton, 1970, Doc.81 of 9th July 1427 and Doc. 83 of 29th May 1433). Perhaps it was Luca Fancelli who was called "Luca da Settignano" and whose name, along with that of his brother Jacopo, was entered in the account book of work on San Lorenzo, published by Isabella Hyman (Fifteenth Century Florentine Studies: The Palazzo Medici and a Ledger for the Church of S. Lorenzo, Ph.D., 1968, New York University, University Microfilms; "Notes and Speculations on S. Lorenzo, Palazzo Medici and an Urban Project by Brunelleschi", Journal of the Society of Architectural

Historians, Vol.XXIV, no.2, 1975, pp.98-120). According to Hyman, he worked for a short period in 1448. However, there were others called Luca da Settignano. The matriculation lists of the guild of Pietre e Legnami (A.S.F., Bk.2) contain, for example, the names of "Lucas Simonii Bizi ... de Settignano scarpellator" who matriculated on 8th March 1464 (f.124v.) and "Lucas Pieri mechinj de septignano scarpellatore" who matriculated on 28th September 1465 (f.125v.). Hyman suggests that the Jacopo di Bartolo mentioned (Hyman, 1968, no.502, p.388) was Jacopo di Bartolomeo da Settignano, Luca's father. Of course, Luca's brother's name would have been Jacopo di Jacopo, if the brothers who worked in 1448 were related to Jacopo di Bartolo. In his Life of Brunelleschi, Vasari wrote, "Fu esecutore di questo palazzo (Pitti) Luca Fancelli, architetto fiorentino, che fece per Filippo molte fabbriche, e per Leon Batista Alberti la cappella maggiore nella nunziata di Firenze, a Lodovico Gonzaga; il quale lo condusse a Mantova, dov' egli vi fece assai opere, e quivi tolse donna e vi visse e morì, lasciando gli eredi che ancora dal suo nome si chiamano i Luchi." (Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.II, p.373). In his Life of Alberti, Vasari made of his Luca Fancelli two people; a Salvestro Fancelli who worked on the SS. Annunziata project, and a Luca who worked on the Mantuan projects: "Fu esecutore de' disegni e modelli di Leon Batista Salvestro Fancelli fiorentino, architetto e scultore ragionevole; il quale condusse secondo il voler di detto Leon Batista, tutte l'opere che fece fare in Firenze con

giudizio e diligenza straordinaria: ed in quelli di Mantova, un Luca fiorentino; che abitando poi sempre in quella città e morendovì, lasciò il nome, secondo il Filarete, alla famiglia de' Luchi che v'è ancor oggi." (Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.II, p.545-56). Vasari acquired new information on his travels between the times of publication of the two editions of the Lives, and the Life of Alberti seems to have benefited more than the Life of Brunelleschi. Luca Fancelli was in Florence in 1456 (Doc.144), 1458 (Doc.203), 1463 (See, F. Rodolico, "Ricerca ed acquisto di 'pietre antiche' alla corte dei Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Italiano, Anno CXIV, 1956, p.752, letter of November), 1460 and 1461 (See, C. Brown, "Luca Fancelli in Mantua...", pp.153-66, checklist). His visits to Florence were surely not long enough for him to have involved himself in the time-consuming direction of building programmes. It is unlikely that he executed the building work of the Palazzo Pitti (P. Sanpaolesi ("Il Palazzo Pitti e gli Architetti Fiorentini della Discendenza Brunelleschiana", Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf, Berlin, 1968, pp.124-35) was not dogmatic in suggesting otherwise. For chronological information regarding the building of the palace, see, F. Morandini, "Palazzo Pitti. La sua costruzione e i successivi ingrandimenti", Commentari, Vol. 16, 1965, pp.25-46.). Brown's checklist shows that he was busy in the Mantovano in the early 1470s. Of course, he could have made drawings and models for Alberti, but Vasari wrote specifically that Salvestro Fancelli worked on the buildings.

However, Vasari's confusion in the Life of Brunelleschi may have suited his dogmatic purpose. The admirable Palazzo Pitti was executed by the same master who built the unsatisfactory "cappella maggiore" of SS. Annunziata. The one design being given to Brunelleschi and the other to Alberti, the relative merits of the two architects are clearly implied. Alberti, more prepared theoretically -and perhaps not exemplifying a balance that the artist-literato, Vasari, thought that he himself did- produced a failure. Brunelleschi, who is implicitly compared with Alberti, was the theoretical and practical architect and, even where he did not actually execute a work, but it was put into the hands of an impartial executor, produced a successful building.

In the Life of Brunellschi, Vasari linked two generations with Fancelli's name. Filarete had made clear that Brunelleschi represented the first generation of the classical revival, and, insofar as Alberti's name may be linked with the Palazzo Rucellai, that he represented the second.

147. P. Carpeggiani (1971) thinks that the Palazzo Secco at S. Martino Gusnago was Fancelli's first whole project. He dates it to the 1450s. In "La Ghirardina" at Motteggiana, he sees a further assimilation of "la cultura padana". It too, he dates to the 1450s. Marani (1961, p.78) dates the Palazzo Secco and "La Ghirardina" to about 1460. See also, R. Campagnari, "La Ghirardina di Motteggiana", in Palazzi e Ville del Contado Mantovano, a cura dell'

Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, pp.7-14; G. dal Prato, "Una concezione di Luca Fancelli. Il Palazzo Pastore di San Martino Gusnago", in Corti e Dimore del Contado Mantovano, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1969, pp.3-11. Campagnari (p.7) wrote that, from its appearance, "La Ghirardina" was to be dated to shortly after the middle of the 15th century. Regarding the question of the attribution of these buildings, see also below, Chapter VI, Part I.

148. See, Marani, 1961, section 4 of chapter on Fancelli.
149. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.XI, pp.629-30, of 9th February 1487, from Gian Galeazzo Sforza at Vigevano to Francesco Gonzaga, and Doc.XII, pp.630-32, from Luca at Milan to Lorenzo de' Medici, 12th April 1487, and Doc.XIII, p.633, of 19th December 1487. See also, Lodovico Sforza's letter of 19th December 1487, to Mantua, in Luca Beltrami e il Duomo di Milano, a cura di A. Cassi Ramelli, Milano, 1964, p.351ff. In 1490, Gafurio went to Mantua and Urbino to engage the services of Luca and Francesco di Giorgio (P. Mezzanotte, "Il Duomo", Pt.VIII of Storia di Milano, Vol.VI, Milano, 1955, p.924). Luca was elected capomaestro of the Duomo in Florence. See, G. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., p.239, note; C. Guasti, La Cupola di Santa Maria del Fiore, Firenze, 1857, pp.118-19, Doc.338, 24th April 1494; Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.XVII, pp.634-35, and Doc.XVIII, pp.635-36; C. von Fabriczy, "Giuliano da Maiano", Jahrbuch der Koniglich

Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, Berlin, 1903, Vol.24, p.175,
Deliberation of the opera of 17th September 1491.

150. See above, Chapter I, note 32. C. Mack ("The Rucellai Palace: Some New Proposals", Art Bulletin, Vol.56, 1974, pp.517-29) believes that the facade was built after 1461. He denies the importance of the seam that Sanpaolesi found after the fifth bay from the left. He fails to notice, however, that mistakes were made in the cutting and laying of stones in the upper bays to the right. Elsewhere, stones were laid and cut with great care. A change in executive control took place when work was going forward on the facade of a part of the palace that was acquired by Giovanni Rucellai after 1457. He notes that "...those who favour Alberti as the architect of the Rucellai palace place great weight upon stylistic considerations...", but can have made little attempt to follow their arguments. The tense balance of the facade of the Rucellai palace makes such a contrast with the slack facades of the 'city' palace at Pienza that it is necessary to see the latter work as the adaptation of the former by someone who failed to appreciate the concentrated discipline that went into its invention. The scarcely modelled and sharply incised facade of the Rucellai palace was drawn out on paper and no 'proof' was needed at Pienza before it could be designed. The facade was surely built before the Palazzo Piccolomini and Filarete probably saw it in the fifties.

151. Filarete/Spencer, f.100r. "Ripose il Signore: 'Signiore a me ancora piacciono assai mapure questi moderni ancora mi piaccono et paionmi begli.'

'Signiore e sono begli ma eglia a fare luno collaltro quanto el di colla notte ancora a me sollevano piacere questi moderni, ma poi chio cominciai a gustare questi antichi mi sono venuti innodio quelli moderni ancora io nel principio se alcuna cosa facevo andavo pure a questa maniera moderna perche ancora il Signore mio padre sequitava pure questi modi.'

'Ma come visete Voi cosi aveduto di questo?'

'Signiore eglie vero che pure io o disiderato dimutare qualche foggia che fusse differentiato et ancora udendo dire che affirenze si husava dedicare a questi modi antichi io diterminai di avere uno di queglii i quali fussino nominati siche praticando cosi conlloro manno svegliato in modo che al presente io non farei fare una minima cosa chenon la facessi al modo anticho et se vi ricorda quando la vostra Signioria fu in quelle nostre stanzette...'

'io le vidi bene et piacquonmi assai.'

'Signiore allora cera uno di queglii cortigiani il quale in queste cose era molto intendente il perche lo ritenni con meco parecchi di il quale mi fece alcuno modello di legname di cotali miei hedificetti che voglio fare per mia devotione...'"

152. W. Braghirolli, "Leon Battista Alberti a Mantova. Documenti e Notizie Inedite", Archivio Storico Italiano, Ser.II, Vol. IX, Pt.I, 1869, p.6. Letter of 13th December 1459, in which

Lodovico asked Alberti to send a copy of Vitruvius to Pius II (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.30, f.47r.).

153. S. Lang, "The Programme of the SS. Annunziata in Florence", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.XVII, 1954, p.299.
154. A. Quintavalle (Prospettiva e Ideologia, Alberti e la cultura del sec. XV, Parma, 1967, p.159) wrote of Fancelli -"un esecutore di cultura michelozziana"- "...suo non può essere il grandioso Palazzo di Revere, in costruzione sul '50, e neppure l'altretanto grandioso Ospedale Grande iniziato nel 1450 anch' esso. Tutti e due questi edifici recano i segni di una personalità ben più grande del Fancelli..." He followed this sensible estimation of the young Fancelli with the bald statement that Alberti must have been responsible for the buildings.
155. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., pp.167-69, Doc.LXIV, letter of 1st May 1457, from Giovanni da Gaiole to Giovanni de' Medici.
156. Gaye, op.cit., p.170, refers to a document of 3rd April 1459, about Manetti's salary of £6 per month.
157. Gaye, op.cit., p.170 and p.239. On 24th May 1460, Manetti was architect "del nostro lavorerio del tondo." See also, P. Tonini, Il Santuario della Santissima Annunziata di

Firenze, Firenze, 1876. He was also involved with the project in 1447 (3rd July)(E. Casalini, Il Chiostro Grande della SS. Annunziata di Firenze, Firenze, 1967, p.5, n.18).

158. C. Guasti, op.cit., Docs.298, 299, 300; Gaye, op.cit., p. 170.

159. C. Guasti, op.cit., Doc.299.

160. Later, he became Podestà of Bologna (See, for example, A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, f.78, n.796.), and of Pavia (See, Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Archivio Mediceo avanti il Principato, Vol.I, Roma, 1951, pp.122, 156, 293.).

161. At this time, the plague was abroad in Florence. Michelozzo's election as capomaestro of the Duomo, of 28th June 1448 (Guasti, Doc.292), was not reconfirmed until 6th August 1451, "...per non essersi adunati i consoli dell'Arte della Lana a cagione della pestilenza durata quasi due anni." (Guasti, Doc.295). Lodovico Gonzaga was in Milan to arrange the release of his brother, Carlo, from imprisonment by Francesco Sforza (Mazzoldi, 1961, p.11, note 34).

162. According to Litta (Famiglie Celebri Italiane, Ser.I^a, (1841), Vol.IV, Tav.III), Gian Francesco della Mirandola (d. November 1467) began building a fortress that was finished by his son, Galeotto. It is just possible that Manetti was involved in the planning of the work.

163. Casalini, op.cit., p.5, n.18, 3rd July 1447.
164. W. Braghirolli, "Die Baugeschichte der Tribuna der Santissima Annunciata in Florenz", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.II, Berlin/Stuttgart, 1879, p.260; P. Roselli, Core e Cupola della SS. Annunziata a Firenze, Pisa, 1971, Doc.I, 23rd September 1444.
165. It proved to be a bothersome project. Braghirolli (op.cit.) gives transcriptions of many of the letters that document the dispute between Lodovico, with his agent in Florence, and a faction of objectors to his plan.
166. See below, Chapter VI, Part II, for a discussion of the project and the question of its authorship.
167. Gaye, op.cit., pp.169-71, note. Details of Manetti's age are given from his Catasto returns. In 1433, Manetti said that he was 29 years old. In 1442, he said that his wife was thirty years of age and that he was 40. He said that he was 44 in 1446, but that his wife was 28. His first wife must have died if his sums were correct.
168. In the later part of the decade, work was done at Gonzaga, but its extent is not known and the palace does not survive.
169. H. Saalman("Tommaso Spinelli, Michelozzo, Manetti and Rossellino", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.XXV, no.3, 1966, pp.151-64) sees Manetti being

without a strong artistic personality and, therefore, being suggestible.

170. For example, the capitals and columns of the garden loggia at the Badia of Fiesole, though coarser in execution than the corbel capitals at Revere, share with them a general proportion. Some of the designs are similar. In both groups, variety was sought. The Fiesole examples were the work of Bruoso di Benedetto and his brother Benedetto (C. von Fabriczy, Filippo Brunelleschi, sein Leben und seine Werke, Stuttgart, 1892, p.590). Isabella Hyman (1975, p.112) showed that Bruoso worked on the Palazzo Medici and S. Lorenzo in 1447-8.

171. On 8th March 1449, Lodovico received permission from Nicholas V to go ahead with the building of a new hospital (Amadei, op.cit., Vol.II, p.64).

172. The foundation stone was laid in February 1449, and a Papal Bull was issued in June of that year. It announced that the building was "...ad instar Florentinensis et Senensis hospitalium." (P. Foster, "Per il disegno dell'Ospedale di Milano", Arte Lombarda, 38-38, 1973, pp.1-22). Marani (1961, p.68) seems to believe that the hospital of S. Matteo at Pavia was the immediate ancestor of the hospital at Mantua. (Marani himself, however, attributes the Mantuan hospital, for stylistic reasons, to a Tuscan architect. If the hospitals at Pavia and Milan looked to Tuscan models, it

seems, prima facie, unlikely that a Tuscan designer would have looked to a secondary source.).

173. V. Montanara (1970) wrote that, in a recent programme of restoration, intonaco had been stripped from the battlements. The crenellations of the Palazzo del Podestà in Mantua were also painted. Luca Fancelli wrote on 12th August 1462, "Perche egli si chominerera lunj a depingere e merli soto al zufo del pallazo del podesta..." Suggestions were invited (Doc.231).

174. As has already been said, the roof is new. Holes in the brickwork of the inner faces of the towers visible below the present roof suggest that, at one time, it was lower (Fig.65). Originally, according to Montanara, the roof was intended to be higher.

175. A window on the north face of the east tower (Fig.68) may be an exception.

176. A later reference, of 31st October 1456 (Doc.154), suggests that it was one of Lodovico's apartments.

177. Albertino seems to have supplied the job through Bartolomeo Pendaglia, or else Bartolomeo, on a different occasion, supplied what were probably stones for thresholds or the like, and benches. Albertino had been instructed to send six of the former and ten of the latter, but Bartolomeo,

who lived in the Ferrarese, complained that he had not been paid for providing twenty thresholds and two benches. Lodovico wrote apologetically to Bartolomeo on 21st November 1450 (Doc.77) and instructed the vicar, on the same day, to attend to the matter of his payment (Doc.78). Bartolomeo Pendaglia was Borso d'Este's factor general (See, G. Tagliati, "Relazioni tra la famiglia Romei e la corte estense nel secolo XV", in Il Rinascimento nelle Corti Padane, società e cultura, Bari, 1977, note 26, pp.66-7.). Could these 'soglie' be foundation stones for columns, or even plinths? It is the number twenty that provokes the conjecture.

178. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.14, f.45v, n.369.

179. Not always does the production of brick at Revere mean that work was to be done there. A letter of 17th October 1375 (Doc.24) shows that, in the 14th century, the furnaces at Revere supplied various building sites. In 1468 (14th March), bricks were sent from Revere to S. Sebastiano (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2409, Giovanni Antonio da Rippari at Revere to Lodovico Gonzaga.). On 6th June 1451, the vicar of S. Benedetto Po was ordered to send carts to Revere for the transportation of bricks and lime to Ponte Molino (Doc. 91). There are many cases of Revere's furnaces supplying other works.

180. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.14, f.58v, n.510.

181. Ponte Molino was at the point where the "via Claudia Augusta" crossed the river Tartaro (B. Bresciani, Castelli Veronesi, Verona, 1962, p.109).
182. It is perhaps worth remarking in passing that beams are the divisions between intervals, and planks are the intervals. In space, beams are that with which counting is done, and planks are that which is counted (-for their edges are contiguous). That with which counting is done is one more (if the numbers are the limits) or one less (if the ends of intervals are the limits) than what is counted. If it is assumed that intervals are equal and that planks are of uniform size, there should be an equal number of planks for all intervals (numbering one more or less than the number of beams). It makes no difference whether planks run parallel or at right angles to beams, since areas are being considered, and beams span an area equal to that covered by planks. In building, it is more likely that intervals are the limits of spaces, for supporting walls or dissimilar supporting elements mark their ends. In fact, these numbers -14 and 34- are perplexing, for there is no simple relationship of numbers of beams to numbers of planks if the space is single or double (e.g. 34 planks covering 15 intervals or 17 planks covering 8 intervals). It is with three spaces that a number of intervals can be achieved such that the number of beams is related simply to the number of planks. For example, two groups of five and one of four, with the limits at the edges of the groups of intervals, make a total of 17 inter-

vals. Two planks could measure each interval. However, the document mentions not three but two spaces to be covered. If the ten planks were required for one of the coverings (and not both), the group of 34 was to be added to an incomplete group already at Revere, or else did not cover a rectangular space.

183. Another carver mentioned in correspondence was certainly a northerner. He was "Jacomo da Como tayapetra"(A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.20, f.20v.). Document 64 may refer to the same man. It is on the subject of a stable or a dwelling made of stone by "Jacomo de Zohanne tayapetra habitante in Verona".

184. Reference to just a few documents is sufficient to demonstrate the extent of Lodovico's interest in building. It exercised itself on all levels. He attended to the payment of groups of workers (Doc.55) and to individual craftsmen (Doc.167). He moved groups around the territory (Doc.57) and traced the movements of individuals (Doc.68). The provision of materials, from bricks (Doc.96) and relatively humble nails and dowels (Doc.61) to noble monolithic columns (Doc.66), engaged his attention. The decisiveness of his interventions in technical matters is suggested by his instructions regarding the tie-rods (Doc.76).

185. It is possible that the passage refers to work at Ponte Molino. But there, Gisulfo de Gisulfis was in charge and

would be expected to be invested with these powers.

186. However, Lodovico does not appear to have been so happy with that instruction when he wrote on 26th June 1451 (Doc. 94).

187. Between the columns themselves a certain consistency was perhaps required. Lorenzo, who had had so much to do with the columns when they were delivered, was expected to work the stones that went above them (Doc.184).

Chapter IV.

188. Other craftsmen were in north Italy at the time. For example, A. Bertolotti (Artisti Bolognesi, Ferraresi ed alcuni altri, Bologna, 1862, p.2) gave a reference of 31st December 1447 to work "...nella fabbrica di palazzo e a chastello (in Ferrara) e a campo santo ... e salari dati a M. Antonio da Firenze, ingegniero di palazzo."
189. The lowest three on the side of the tower have been chipped down to the level of the lowest parts of the surrounds. The profile of the mouldings of the lintels may be discerned as the boundary between the rough, chipped stone and the smooth surfaces (Fig.35). Why this was done remains a mystery, for it is clear that the stones were carved on the ground and were then put in place. There is surely no possibility that mouldings were intended to be applied to roughened surfaces of stones.
190. F. Rodolico, Le Pietre delle Città d'Italia, Firenze, 1953, p.187.
191. A. Magnaguti, Studi intorno alla zecca di Mantova, Milano, 1913, p.25. Magnaguti also referred to Bartolomeo della Fiera as another worker at the mint. In a letter of 17th October 1462, from Lodovico to Cristoforo Geremia, there was mention of "Zohane di Strigi nostro thesorero". (U. Rossi, "Cristoforo Geremia", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I,

1888, p.409.).

192. A. Bertolotti (Figuli, Fonditori e Scultori in relazione con la corte di Mantova..., Milano, 1890, p.67) referred to two assistants of Fancelli: Sandri di Bartolo and Francesco. See also below, note 214 and Chapter VI, notes 442, 443.

Braghirolli (1876, p.613, note 11) concluded from Luca's expression of willingness to accept an invitation to go to Venice that work at Revere was nearly finished at this time. However, it is clear from the end of the letter that Luca had no intention of going off. Document 174 shows that Luca was not employed to make stonework only for Revere. There is no indication in the letter that work at Revere was nearly finished.

193. This door, of inferior workmanship, could be the result of an early attempt by Fancelli to work hard Verona marble (Fig.72). It is unlikely that it was designed by the person who designed the front door. Its rather stumpy capitals with fan-shaped acanthus and low relief recall those chased on the Isaac relief of Ghiberti's bronze doors or, more closely, those carved on the tabernacle of St. Louis at Orsanmichele. The capital style attributed by Saalman to Michelozzo is also similar ("Filippo Brunelleschi: Capital Studies", Art Bulletin, Vol.40, 1958, pp.113-37). Perhaps a more plausible suggestion is that the door is the work of a local master after a design by Fancelli or another Tuscan.

194. See above, Chapter I, note 32.
195. M. Salmi (1961, p.15ff) linked the palace at Revere with the 'Domus Nova' and both with Filarete's treatise -and especially with the palace constructed in a marshy place. He suggested that Fancelli knew the treatise. More likely, Filarete knew the palace at Revere and other castle-palaces of Lombardy. Fancelli may, however, have taken a knowledge of the treatise to his designing of the 'Domus Nova'. The general shape of the palace at Revere was not Fancelli's responsibility. The 'Domus Nova' could be described typologically as a hybrid of the palace at Revere and the Palazzo Rucellai.
196. It should be noted that Filarete suggested 'improvements' on the palace at Revere type. Pediments atop the towers, for example, gave a more antique appearance.
197. E. Mendes Manuel & G. Dallai, "Nuove indagini sullo spedale degli Innocenti a Firenze", Commentari, XVII, 1966, Doc.XIV, p.101. H. Burns ("Quattrocento Architecture and the Antique: Some Problems", in Classical Influences on European Culture, AD. 550 - 1500, Ed. R. Bolgar, Cambridge, 1971, p.284, note 1) refers to the above article and to the Ph.D. thesis of L. Fulman on SS. Annunziata for further evidence that such was the view. See also, De Re', VII, 12.
198. See, H. Folnesics, "Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der

Architektur und Plastik des XV. Jahrhunderts in Dalmatien", Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Institutes der K.K. Zentral-Kommission für Denkmalfpflege, Band VIII, Vienna, 1914, fig. 88, p.108 and fig.89, p.109.

199. R. Krautheimer, Ghiberti, Princeton, 1970, p.87.

200. Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.II, p.442. Vasari may have been thinking of such things as the aedicule on S. Maria Rotonda. Giuliano da Sangallo drew the "Tabernacolo di Santa Maria Ritonda di Roma" in the Barberini Codex (C. Huelsen, Il Libro di Giuliano da Sangallo, Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424, Leipzig, 1910). It differs from the S. Croce and the Revere examples in having columns placed before shallow pilasters instead of pilasters alone (Fig.78).

201. In the corbels, virtuosity and variety are found. They come out of an ambience close to Michelozzo. Virtuosity inhibited invention in the Donatellian sense, being, rather, controlled and domesticated. It may be distinguished from Desiderio's too. Desiderio -closer to Donatello- strove to maintain invention, but he subordinated it to virtuosity - his exemplary technique- and it lost its ability to surprise and shock. The corbels at Revere belong in a tradition of less committed inventiveness.

202. The alternative possibility -that the inner frame and the corbels are by a hand different from that which carved the

rest of the door- seems unlikely. It is worth noting that the door appears to be expressible more simply in Florentine braccia than in Mantuan braccia, and may have been carved by someone following a drawing and provided with a Florentine ruler. Fancelli would not, of course, be excluded on these ground from a list of designers to whom the invention of the door may be attributed. But it would perhaps be surprising that he did not design using the local measure. Figure 81 shows sizes in Florentine inches as well as Imperial feet and inches. Other proportions are approximate. The door at Revere differs from that described by Alberti in several respects. For example, the passageway is less than two widths high (cf. Alberti, De Re', VII, 12). Then, Alberti believed that the height of the columns supporting the architrave should be equal to the distance between the outer edges of the bases. The architrave at Revere is higher than the whole door is wide by about the width of the doorway's lintel. The door is narrowed by slightly more than the added distances that the bases are displaced, from the lines of the outer edges of the jambs, towards the axis. The Corinthian pillars at Revere do not follow Alberti's instructions. They are nine shafts high, excluding the plinth of the base and are therefore close to the Ionic proportion (IX, 7.). Alberti's Corinthian column is ten and a half shafts high (VII, 6 and IX, 9.). The entablature lacks mutules and the proportions of some of the mouldings -notably the large egg-and-dart band and the very long and thin dentils- seem to differ from Alberti's (See, VII, 9.).

However, general proportions of elements seem to be similar (cf. Fig.83). Although rules regarding the proportions of columns would be strict, the composition of the door was not necessarily determined by such rigid rules. Alberti wrote that the opening could be wider and the jambs could be treated differently in the case of houses for private persons. In some respects, the door at Revere resembles Alberti's Ionic doorway. The jamb, for example, is closer to his size for the Ionic door -one sixth of the width of the opening- than the Corinthian -one seventh of the width. The numbers in the circles on drawn figure 82 are generated according to Alberti's instructions from the width of the doorway -45fl.br". Other numbers do not need to be altered. The scale of the doorway at Revere is not related to trabeation as Alberti advocated. However, it may be related to the floor level of the piano nobile. Alberti required that the lintel of the Corinthian door be laid two thirds of the distance between pavement and architrave of the portico. Two thirds of the distance between floor level and pavement at Revere is 14'3" (4.343m). The architrave of the door at Revere is about 14'5" (4.394m) from the level of the pavement. The differences between the door at Revere and those described by Alberti and Vitruvius (1960 Edition, p.118ff.) show that the designer did not follow these two written sources (though the sophistication of the work would tend to suggest that he was not ignorant of them). An archaeological approach could explain the form of the capitals and knowledge of recent workshop practice could explain other features. As

a controlled improvisation using those sources, the door, whose classicizing appearance is persuasive if not canonical, requires an authorship neither entirely within an artisan tradition nor isolated from one. The ingenuity, learning and imagination that went into the designing of the work establish conditions for an attribution.

203. G. Paccagnini ("Il Mantegna e la Plastic nell'Italia Settentrionale", Bollettino d'Arte, 1961, Ser.IV, Anno XLVI, pp.69-71) attributed work in the Castel di S. Giorgio to Fancelli.

204. On 14th May 1456, it was Lodovico's intention to have Luca return from Florence to finish fireplaces for Revere. Luca, however, was ill, and Lodovico's messenger, Giovanni da Milano, had not been able to find him (Doc.144). To Luca's reply that he had regained his health, Lodovico wrote on 12th June 1456, to speed his departure, insisting at the same time that Luca should be completely recovered, for otherwise, a relapse would render him incapable of doing the work (Doc.145). On 23rd July and 1st August, Luca's arrival was awaited (Docs.147, 148). Perhaps he did arrive, and, shortly afterwards, returned to Florence. More likely, his departure from Florence was delayed by the continuing danger of the plague. At any rate, there is no evidence of his presence at Revere until 1st October (Doc.149). Before 4th October, he had written that the chimney-pieces and the door were near completion (Doc.150). As has been seen, the

door was not erected until December of the following year. On 31st October 1456, two chimney-pieces were ready to be installed. Their locations were specified -one for the "camera della volta" and the other for the "camera nostra della sala" (Doc.154). It is worth observing that Luca did not intend to install them himself, but had brought on site "uno che sa murare". A letter of similar form was written on 20th November and shows that one of the fireplaces was yet to be installed (Doc.155). This time, Luca was in charge of work. On 3rd August 1457, the vicar was told to relay Lodovico's instruction that a fireplace was to be transported to Mantua (Doc.161) and, on 8th August, received the go-ahead to put in the fireplace of the "Camera di Spiritelli" (Doc.162). Luca was at work on a chimney-piece for the castello (di S. Giorgio) on 11th December 1457 (Doc.170). Yet another was the subject of a letter to Luca, of 14th December. He was not to proceed until he had discussed it with Lodovico (Doc.171. See also, Doc.172).

G. Gerola ("Un' Impresa ed un motto di casa Gonzaga", Rivista d'Arte, 1930, pp.381-402) identified the four-braccia fireplace mentioned in the first document with that described by Sissa in a communication to d'Arco (Delle Arti e degli Artefici..., p.71), and bearing the device of the rocky island and the motto AMUMOC. Its Palazzo Ducale catalogue number is 648. However, from the letter of 6th January 1458, it seems that the fireplace was intended to be used in the "castello". Financial difficulties demanded that no other stonework be provided for the castle (Doc.173). Luca, in

his letter of reply, referred to his work on the chimney-piece that he identified as "quello de corni", and one other (Doc.174). A fireplace was provided later by "M.^{ro} Chiccus lapicida fiorentino". On 27th March 1481, he wrote, "Retrovandone fora di Manthoa de l'anno 1478 per la peste et avendo uno camino de preta viva a Manthoa me fu comesso per parte de la S. V. che el feze condure a Revere et quello io lo mettere a l'opra in lo palazzo. Domand di esser soddisfatto interamente". From A. Bertolotti, Figuli, Fonditori e Scultori..., Milano, 1890, p.68.

205. Of course, there was much destruction of ancient remains in Rome, even in the 15th century, as R. Weiss emphasised (The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, Oxford, 1969, pp.90-104).
206. See, for example, A. Venturi, Storia dell'Arte Italiana, Vol.VIII, Pt.I, Milano, 1923, Fig.189, p.301.
207. That is, no acanthus grows out of the stalks. And volutes are supported by the leaves attached to the calathos. See, H. Saalman, 1958, p.113.
208. Vitruvius, The Ten Books on Architecture, Trans. M. Hicky Morgan, New York, 1960, Bk.IV, Chap.I, 1; Alberti, De Re', VIII, 8.
209. Here, the foliage 'functions' very differently from

Brunelleschi's, for it obscures the strong form of the calathos. Brunelleschi's volutes do not usurp the supporting function of the structural core, whose form continues to be discernible. Rather, they proclaim insouciant support -something only imperfectly stated in the calathos itself. At Revere, it is not plausible that the foliate volutes themselves should support the abacus: yet the calathos is barely visible above the stalks. Consequently, the foliage at the vital junction of capital and abacus becomes mere decorative modelling of material.

It is perhaps worthwhile to emphasise with regard to the capitals what is clear from other considerations -that decorative work at Revere originates in an environment closer to Michelozzo and Alberti, perhaps, than to Brunelleschi. The capitals of the door do not, as has been said, follow Brunelleschi's model. They diverge from that model principally in terms of their expression of function. Their principal justification is decorative.

Brunelleschi's capital is constant in form where the same function is to be served. However, what is in common between varied capitals lies behind their individuality. An example of this would be Michelozzo's Cappella del Crocefisso in S. Miniato al Monte, in Florence. The capitals are different from one another in decorative treatment. Indeed, the decorative purpose there dominates the expression of structural function to the extent that, perhaps trying to appear like found objects -like those used elsewhere in the church- the capitals are elaborations of different orders. However,

the actual function is constant. The form -and the function- in such cases, is hidden in the material. It is the material which is variable. Brunelleschi did not individualise members that were parts of groups, and so the form is not obscured by the material individuality, but coincides with the material. Matter and design are not independent of one another.

The practicality of Brunelleschi, as opposed to the theoretical approach of Alberti (emphasized by Manetti in the biography of Brunelleschi and by Vasari in the Lives of both) may follow from a discussion that is related to the one above. If the intellect is argued not to perform the act of separating the form from the matter (Aquinas argued this function for the intellect.), but it is argued instead that forms are created such that they cannot exist without the matter (like the module, or Brunelleschi's capital as it has been considered), the creator of objects in which the form and the matter coincide with perfect economy is the practical man 'par excellence'. It would be the lack of individuality in Brunelleschi's architectural members -creating the visible universal- that makes form exist properly in matter. Theory and practice are equivalent. At Revere, despite the fact that the capitals of the front door are identical, expression of function is not the prime motive. As modelling of material indifferent to that kind of expression or as imitation of antique examples, they are decorative.

The title page of the codex says that it was begun in 1465. However, Huelsen argued that it was begun after 1483, and showed that drawings continued to be added until Giuliano's death in 1516 (p.xxv ff. Text Vol.).

211. Schiavi (Il restauro della chiesa di S. Sebastiano di Leon Battista Alberti in Mantova, Mantova, 1932, p.26) wrote of "...il magnifico portale e le colonne della loggia terrena nel castello di Revere, i cui disegno rileva una mano molto più esperta ed una mente artistica assai più elevata di quella di Luca Fancelli." In fact, as a non-figurative stone-carver, Luca was not unskillful. G. Paccagnini ("Il Mantegna e la Plastica...", 1961, p.70) wrote, "La sua (Fancelli's) attitudine verso la scultura era quella di un abilissimo intagliatore piuttosto che di un vero scultore."
212. H. Saalman, 1958, pp.113-37.
213. Perhaps the situation in the Mantovano resembled that in Milan where Filarete seems to have been regarded as an unwelcome competitor. A document of January 1453 gives that impression: "Sulla proposta di eleggere di nuovo ad ingegnere della fabbrica (of the Duomo) maestro Antonio da Fiorenza, considerando che detto maestro Antonio e superfluo, perche la fabbrica ha gia un ingegnere sufficiente, fu deliberato non doversi accettare." (Annali della fabbrica del Duomo di Milano dall'origine fino al presente ... a cura della sua amministrazione, Milano, 9 Vols., 1877-85, Vol.II,

1880, p.155). M. Lazzaroni & M. Munoz (Filarete, scultore e architetto del secolo XV, Roma, 1903, p.214) wrote, in connection with the hospital, "Gli architetti Lombardi non potevano rassegnarsi a subire la presenza di maestri Toscani che la 'bona memoria' di Francesco Sforza aveva pure validamente protetti..."

214. It is perhaps worth remarking in this connection that Fancelli's assistants did not have the status of mere 'garzoni'. On 10th January 1458, Fancelli described them as 'maestri' (Doc. 174). On 30th April 1459, in a letter to Giovanni da Padova, the ambiguity of their status was explicit: "Perche uno de questi garzoni o sia magistri de Lucha taiapetra chiamato Petro che questi di ha lavorato al Ponte da Goito..." (A.S.M. A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.36, f.17v.). The names of three other assistants are known. See above, note 192, and below, Chapter VI, notes 442, 443.

215. He wrote to Lodovico on 16th March 1473, "...altanto etiam per essere fatto quello edificio sul garbo antiquo non molto dissimile da quello viso fantastico da messer Baptista de Alberti, io per ancho non intendera se l'havera a reussire in chiesa o moschea o sinagoga." (S. Davari, "Ancora della Chiesa di S. Sebastiano in Mantova e di Luca Fancelli", Rassegna d'Arte, 1901, p.94; C. von Fabriczy, "Die Baugeschichte von S. Sebastiano in Mantua", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.XXVII, Berlin, 1904, pp.84-5). Fantastico seems to have had a positive value for Lodovico.

On 27th August 1461, he wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg from Cavriana. He would be needed on site because work was progressing apace on something "molto fantastico". (Marani, 1961, p.63, note 102. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2096).

216. W. Braghirolli, "Die Baugeschichte der Santissima Annunziata in Florenz", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.II, Berlin/Stuttgart, 1879, Doc.X, p.271. Letter of 27th April 1471, from Pietro del Tovaglia to Lodovico Gonzaga. See also, P. Roselli, 1971, Doc.45, p.33.
217. See, L. Pratilli, "Felice Feliciano alla luce dei suoi codici", Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Classe di Scienze Morali e Letterari, Anno 1939-40, Vol.XCIX, Pt.II, pp.33-106. M. Salmi ("Antonio Averlino detto il Filarete e l'architettura Lombarda", Atti del 1^o Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura, Firenze, 1938, pp.185-196) put Filarete's antiquarian approach on a par with that of Cyriaco, Felice and Giovanni Marcanova.
218. C. Mitchell, "Felice Feliciano Antiquarius", Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol.XLVII, 1961, pp.197-221.
219. G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, Roma, 1970 (Reprint of 1911 Edition), p.391.
220. W. Ferguson ("Interpretations of the Renaissance", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XII, no.4, 1951, pp.483-95)

suggested that the passion for the antique belonged to the educated urban layman (p.494). However, the prince, with power whose origins were of a sort medieval and feudal, was not excluded from this passion. D. Hay ("Italy and Barbarian Europe", Italian Renaissance Studies, Ed. E. Jacob, London, 1960, p.67) characterised the prince as a product of urban lay society. He wrote: "The Italian prince as patron of fine art and literature, as the centre of political and social activity, as the fount of courtesy which could readily be adapted to chivalric traditions, was himself in every sense a product of the bourgeois environment..." Hay's characterisation saves the prince from the embarrassment of changing allegiance to a lower class taste. But would it not be simpler to question how the antique could satisfy aristocratic tastes and values? Perhaps the aristocratic posture of princes should not be denied. It could be said, for example, that the readiness to adapt to chivalric traditions and to maintain political systems deriving from medieval society was anti-bourgeois in origin; that aristocratic purposes were maintained. Ferguson's supposition is that the antique did not submit to differing interpretations. But Poggio Bracciolini and Guarino da Verona interpreted it differently in accordance with different political prejudices. Then, the antique, viewed as food for the imagination, could recommend itself to a prince at home in the world of chivalric myth without creating insufferable frictions. Frictions would result if the life of the imagination met the world of action.

221. B. Berenson (The Italian Painters of the Renaissance, Phaidon, 1959, p.147) saw the work of Mantegna fulfilling a similar purpose. He wrote, "If ever there was a just occasion for applying the word 'Romantic' -and it means, I take it, a longing for a state of things based not upon facts but upon the evocations of art and literature- then that word should be applied to Mantegna's attitude towards antiquity."
222. See, F. Saxl, "Jacopo Bellini and Mantegna as Antiquarians", in A Heritage of Images -a selection of lectures, Ed. H. Honor & J. Fleming, Peregrine, 1970.
223. The ancient world as the goal of a kind of escapism seems to have been the shared idea of Mantegna and Felice. Even if the account of the trip to Lake Garda is a fiction, Mantegna must have read it. As a fiction, it would have represented an ambition and would have been an imaginative realization. C. Mitchell ("Archaeology and Romance in Renaissance Italy", Italian Renaissance Studies, Ed. E. Jacob, 1960, pp.455-83) wrote, "Felice and his companions, following in a fashion which Cyriac ... personally created, had in a sense reached their goal; their learning, as they acted (or pretended to act) à l'antique, already anticipated their objective; they were looking not so much for novel finds, as for fresh reflections and confirmations of an antiquity that shone in their imaginations."
- Sometimes Mantegna's visual reconstruction may have been a

prelude to some implied statement about the ancient civilization's collapse. For a case of explicit comment of this kind, see, J. Caldwell, "Mantegna's St. Sebastian, 'Stabilitas' in a pagan world", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.36, 1973, pp.373-77. The theme of the desirability of timelessness is also that of the inscription on a Gonzaga coin: BUENA. FE. NO. ES. MUDABLE. But such possibilities are subsequent upon a first evocative intention -"lo ... spirito rievocativo" of V. Fasolo ("L'Ispirazione Romana negli Sfondi Architettonici del Mantegna", Palladio, N.S., Anno XIII, 1963, pp.79-84). Regarding the backgrounds of Mantegna's pictures, see also, V. Fasolo, "L'Architettura di Mantegna", in Arte, Pensiero e Cultura ... a Mantova, pp.219-32, and, A. Tamassia, "Visioni di antichità nell'opera del Mantegna", Rendiconti, Atti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Vol. XXVIII, Fasc.III-IV, Anno 1955-56, Vaticano, 1957, pp.213-49. Fasolo (1963) denied Tamassia's contention that Mantegna had first hand experience of Rome early in his career. He wrote (p.81) of "...il modo immaginoso di osservare e rivivere più poeticamente che dotteamente il rudero romano..." Both writers agree that he created not a topographical view but a composite picture.

224. P. Kristeller (Mantegna, London, 1901, p.220) wrote of an elegiac mood in earlier works, like the Uffizi triptych and the Prado Death of the Virgin, and of a heroic mood in later works. Fasolo (1963, p.83) writes about the melancholy

air in Mantegna's architectural backgrounds. Perhaps the elegiac tone is continuous in his works insofar as it derives from the dispassionate quality of his figures in their settings and actions. Even facial expressions are delineated, rather than sympathetically revealed.

225. G. Paccagnini (Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Torino, 1969, p.36) wrote, regarding the Sala del Pisanello, of "...un tono più lirico ed elegiaco che epico..." Again, this quality is given by the dispassionate air of his figures. A heroic air is perhaps intended to be communicated by the wind-tossed hair of Malies de l'Espine -a Herculean characteristic, almost.

226. Marani (1961, p.106, note 71) writes that the facade at Revere would have had decoration on intonaco. However, it is unlikely that the whole facade was covered with intonaco and decorated. The brickwork now shows up the carved details. Brickwork itself does not seem to have been regarded as a material lacking in nobility. Apart from the fact that highly decorative terracotta appears on church exteriors (e.g. S. Francesco, Mantua), painted intonaco on the inner faces of the towers under the roof at Revere includes, below a band of swags and vases, a stretch of simulated brickwork (Fig.65).

227. Alberti, De Re', VI, 2 (Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.II, p.449). In Book IX, Chapter 5, Alberti wrote, "...ut vero de

pulchritudine iudices, non opinio, verum animis innata quaedam ratio efficiet."(op.cit., p.813).

Incidentally, Alberti's location of this faculty in an innate reason is the same for Nicholas of Cusa, talking of judgement generally. Cusanus wrote, in De Mente, 4 (c.1450), that the mind judges, "...without ever having been taught to do so, by an inborn faculty." (quoted from Anselm and Nicholas of Cusa, by K. Jaspers, Ed. H. Arendt, Trans. R. Manheim, Harvest Books, 1974, p.40).

228. C. Grayson, An Autograph Letter from Leon Battista Alberti to Matteo de' Pasti, Nov. 18. 1454, New York, 1957. See also, C. Ricci, Il Tempio Malatestiano, Doc.VIII.

229. Alberti, Opere Volgari, Vol.I, a cura di C. Grayson, Bari, 1960, p.63.

230. Aquinas, Selected Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, Trans. R. Goodwin, Ohio, 1965, p.79.

231. Aquinas, op.cit., "On Being and Essence", pp.48-9.

232. Aristotle, Metaphysics, 1039b-1040a. (The Works of Aristotle, Vol.VIII, Ed. J. Smith & W. Ross, Oxford, 1908).

233. Alberti, De Re', VI, 2. "Nos tamen brevitatis gratia sic deffiniemus: ut sit pulchritudo quidem certa cum ratione concinnitas universarum partium in eo cuius sit, ita ut

addi aut diminui aut immutari possit nihil quin improbabil-
ius reddatur."(Bonelli/Portoghesi, p.447).

234. Alberti, De Re', "...quorum alterum istic (disegno) ab ingenio produceretur, alterum a natura susciperetur..." (op.cit., p.15).
235. Alberti, ibid. "Nam aedificium quidem corpus quoddam esse animadvertimus, quod lineamentis veluti alia corpora constaret et materia..." Disegno has no material part: "Neque habet lineamentum in se, ut materiam sequatur..."(I, 1), so that, "...licebit integras formas prescribere animo et mente seclusa omni materia..."(ibid.). Perhaps it is because of the inevitable residual intractableness of matter in even the finest of buildings that ornament is a legitimate part of architecture.
236. Alberti, De Re', Prologue, "Quae ut possit, comprehensione et cognitione opus est rerum optimarum et dignissimum".(op. cit., pp.7-9).
237. L. Vignetti ("Concinnitas"; riflessione sul significato di un termine albertiano", Studi e Documenti di Architettura, n.2, June 1973, Firenze, pp.137-61) discusses the word from a more philological point of view.
238. Alberti, De Re', IX, 5 (Leone/Rykwert). "Totam complectitur hominis vitam et rationes totamque pertractat naturam rerum." (op.cit., p.813).

239. Alberti, ibid.(Leone/Rykwert). "Neque in toto corpore aut partibus viget magis concinnitas quam in se ipsa atque natura; ut eam quidem esse animi rationisque consortem interpreter." He also wrote, "Atqui est quidem concinnitatis munus et paratio partes, quae alioquin inter se natura distinctae sunt, perfecta quadam ratione constituere, ita ut mutuo ad speciem correspondeant."(ibid.).
240. Alberti, ibid.(Leone/Rykwert). "...id apud nos concinnitas nuncupabitur, quam eandem profecto omnis esse gratiae atque decoris alumnam dicimus."(ibid.).
241. Alberti, De Re', VI, 2 (Leone/Rykwert). "...ornamentum autem afflicti et compacti naturam sapere magis quam innati." (op.cit., p.449).
242. Alberti, ibid. "Deesse aliquid spectator ille formarum, aut plus esse in his, quos non probaret, intelligebat, quod ipsum cum pulchritudinis rationibus non conveniret."(ibid.).
243. Aquinas, op.cit., p.10. "Sunt igitur tria principia naturae, scilicet materia, forma et privatio; quorum alterum, scilicet forma, est id ad quod est generatio, alia duo sunt ex parte eius ex quo est generatio."(De Principiis Naturae, Introd. J. Pauson, Fribourg, 1950, p.82). Aristotele, Physics, I, 7.
244. Aquinas, loc.cit. "Unde privatio dicitur principium non per se, sed per accidens, quia scilicet coincidit cum materia;

sicut dicimus quod per accidens medicus aedificat."(op.cit., pp.82-3).

245. In the general sense of juxtaposing local traditional elements and classicizing ones, this was perhaps especially true of the north of Italy. Pica suggested that classicizing and Gothic elements could co-exist in mid 15th century Lombardy because, whereas Brunelleschi's classicism was a rejection of or a reaction against Gothic, and took recourse to the example of Tuscan Romanesque work, the northern builders did not so much reject a style as adopt a new, classical one (A. Pica, "Il Brunelleschi e le origini del Rinascimento lombardo", Atti del 1° Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura, Firenze, 1936, pp.165-71).

246. For example, the drawing of the Castel S. Angelo in the Codex Marcanova. In the situation in which an ideal life-courty or scholarly- could be lived in the imagination, an ideal ambience for that life existed. When the attempt was made to create the ambience really, the intention was, at bottom, non-practical, because based on an artistic conception. In this situation, it is justifiable to build a mock castle or villa or palace which could exist independently of functional realities. Such a structure is no less than a representation, like a painter's depicted version, and is 'real' in the same limited sense.

Chapter V.

247. Domenico's name also appears in a letter of 2nd August 1457 from Lodovico, at Goito, to Albertino de' Pavesi (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.30, f.33r.). This painter may be the same person as "Domenico dei Medici pittore", who received a tax concession on a house in the 'Contrada Griffone", on 4th January 1461 (C. d'Arco, Delle Arti e degli Artefici..., Doc.8, p.10).
248. For example, 60 dressed stones that were ordered on 1st August (Doc.98) were, on 3rd August (Doc.99), identified more precisely. They were for Ponte Molino.
249. The side wings also differ between themselves at crenellation level. On the east flank, a crenellation abuts the tower. On the west, an interspace intervenes (Figs.35,37).
250. In October 1453 (Doc.124), financial difficulties prevented the vicar from acquiring brick, but Lodovico still wanted him to muddle through as best he could. Brick continued to be exported and appropriated to other jobs. Barbara, on 30th June 1455, asked for 30.000 bricks that Lodovico had given her to use (Doc.132). She wrote again to the vicar of Revere on 6th March 1458, asking that brick or stone, given by Lodovico, be transported (Doc.179). She seems to have been particularly involved with building in the Borgo di S. Giorgio, the suburb at the other end of the Ponte S.

Giorgio from the Castello. The Bertazzolo map of Mantua shows the Borgo di S. Giorgio, and is accompanied by an annotation: "...quale fece edificare la Marchesana Barbara" (C. Berselli, "La Pianta di Mantova di Gabriele Bertazzolo", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno II, 1967, Quad. 10, p.289).

251. This job and others engaged the attentions of Pedro da Barbante. See, Documents 60, 116, 118, 119.
252. Documents 186 and 204 show that lime had to be used shortly after being fired.
253. Wood-cutting seems to have been a job for winter, when the sap was down. This is the implication of a letter regarding the roof timbers of S. Francesco at Rimini. On 21st December (1454), M.^{ro} Alovixe wrote of the need for haste in cutting wood: "...como el ligniame comencia venire in amore, non e piu ben tagliare." (C. Ricci, Il Tempio Malatestiano, Doc.XI, p.589). How long it took for wood to be sufficiently seasoned is another question.
254. The usual method of ceiling rooms left the structure visible. It consisted in laying beams across the space. Joists ran at right angles between the beams. Planks were laid parallel with the beams, over the joists, and their edges were hidden behind narrow laths. See, W. Terni de Gregory, Pittura Artigiana del Rinascimento, Milano, 1958, pp.65ff.

255. If it is correct that the twenty-braccia beams spanned the room above the north portico, it is possible to make inferences regarding the builders' quantity surveying methods. The beams would have to have been trimmed, but it may have been thought safer to over-estimate quantities rather than estimate them accurately. It seems likely that the builders did not refer directly to the extant parts of the structure but to the drawn plan (which may not have carried information about wall thicknesses). It would have been easy to read off lengths, and over-estimation would take account of possible irregularities. The drawing at Revere would have shown how the new design could be adapted to the old. The new design did not force a complete reconsideration of the means of constructing it, for if 9 beams were used for the Sala they had no structural dependence on the columned structure below. (As Figure 91 and Pocket Drawing 5 show, beams would have lain plumb above weak parts of the arcade. The original plan, in which it is suggested five arches spanned the north side of the courtyard, would not have produced this difficulty for the beams would have lain above key-stones and springing points.). If numbers of bricks required were computed from the drawing -every $\frac{2}{3}$ braccio on the drawing being calculated as a brick- a similar over-estimation of materials would occur, because of mortar.

256. It should be noted that if the twenty-braccia beams were nine in number in accordance with the first plan for an arcade of five arches at the north end of the courtyard,

the length was increased (but not the number) to span the wide Sala. The number and length of the fifteen-braccia beams would probably not, then, have been altered for the sake of the second plan. If this is so, intertrabeation was not related to beam-length when the requisition was made out.

257. However, linseed oil could also be used on wall. See, De Re', VI, 9.

258. See Lorenzo's letters of 23rd May 1458 and 4th June 1458 (Docs.191,195). In 1435, Gian Francesco built a new palace at Marmirollo, "prope et extra castrum Marmirololi"(S. Davari, "I Palazzi dei Gonzaga in Marmirollo", Gazetta di Mantova, n.254, 24th-25th Sett. 1890).

259. It has been suggested (p. 96) that the 'camera della volta' was located close to the north entrance tunnel. If it is so that 'camere' for which wood was required on 8th January 1454, were rooms above the main entrance and behind the facade, they were unfinished at that time, and the 'camera della volta' which existed in 1450 would have been on the mezzanine level. A letter of 26th October 1462, refers to "quella camera de la volta in castello, de sotto de la nostra." (Doc.232). If 'castello' here refers to the palace, the reference tends to cast doubt upon the suggested whereabouts of the room. Yet the rooms above the entrance tunnel and adjacent to it are either too small to have the necessary

dignity or too large to be private.

260. An alternative suggestion, taking into account the problem of identifying the 'camera della volta', is that one of the large rooms on the north side of the wing was indeed 'la nostra' (Doc.232), was above the 'camera della volta' and was otherwise known as the 'camera nostra della Sala'. The fireplaces, then, would have been for rooms placed one above another.
261. The placing of stone furnishings was done before the laying of tiles on 17th February 1449 (Doc.58).
262. Lodovico mistakenly said "quadreleti" when he meant "quadrelli" -or the secretary made a mistake.
263. Braghirolli (1876, p.612) misinterpreted this document, supposing that Lorenzo was working on columns for Revere.
264. The number of bricks mentioned -400.000- is very large, and may be a writing error.
265. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2409.
266. L. Ariosto, Orlando Furioso, Canto XLII, 73-77. Here is a description of a palace which has been identified as Revere. The identification is plausible, whilst the description is obviously elaborated with poetic licence. See, E. Faccioli,

"Il Palazzo Ducale di Revere e un episodio dell' 'Orlando Furioso'", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno I, 1966, pp.7-12.

267. Usually, strength and delicacy, when juxtaposed, tend to cancel out one another. The one applied to activity, the other to repose, and they rarely harmonised as in Donatello's bronze David in the Bargello, where the former is past potentiality.

P. Carpeggiani ("Decadenza delle Ville Gonzaghesche", L'Arte, n.6, 1969, p.121) writes of the crenellation used at Revere, "La Ghirardina" at Motteggiana and elsewhere: "...non è mera partitura decorativa, ma una componente lessicale del 'revival' medievale operato dall'artista (Fancelli)". Such an interpretation substitutes for the inconsistency between classical revival in the sculptured details and survival in traditional medieval fortified elements the idea of the building displaying a double revival -classical and medieval. However, the substitution too seems to be inconsistent, this time in terms of the notion of historico-ethical polemic that is generally supposed to underlie 'revival'. The simultaneous 'revival' of forms belonging to different traditions introduces an anachronism in the intellect. It would probably be wiser to regard the continued use of crenellations at Revere and elsewhere in the Mantovano as a kind of modified survival (-the specific decorative form being something of a revival). To suggest that the crenellations of the type used at Revere and elsewhere are of secondary importance, as revival, compared with the classic-

izing features is not to resolve the inconsistency, but is a means of moderating it.

268. J. Sismondi (History of the Italian Republics, London, 1832, Bk.VII, p.739) wrote, "...even more remarkable than man's power of associating ideas is the faculty of disassociating them; while the brains of the fifteenth century fermented with ideas, the various mental functions pursued their separate and independent courses." E. Panofsky ("Artist, Scientist, Genius", in The Renaissance: Six Essays, New York, 1962, pp. 121-82) viewed the period in a rather similar way -as one of 'decompartmentalization'. However, as details of 'content' rather than 'form', they could perhaps be put together to create a rich mixture -a copiousness, of course, rather than a variety.

269. J. Ackerman, "Sources of the Renaissance Villa", Studies in Western Art, Vol.II, Princeton, 1963, p.6ff. K. Swoboda ("Palazzi antichi e medioevali", Bollettino del Centro di Studi per la Storia dell'Architettura, II, 1957, pp.3-32) wrote of the Trajanic villa type -the 'villa con portici ad avancorpi laterali' or the 'Porticusvilla mit Eckrisaliten'- as "...un tipo di villa più massiccio, con caratteristiche di difesa militare."(p.9). In Venice, during the 13th and 14th centuries, the type survived but the corner blocks were flush with the intervening portico wall in most cases. See also, K. Swoboda, "The problem of the Iconography of Late Antique and Early Medieval Palaces", Journal of the

Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.20, 1961, pp.78-89.

270. For example, if Alessandro Gonzaga died, his property was to pass, in the first instance, to Carlo. See, Mazzoldi, 1961, p.3.

271. Mazzoldi, op.cit., pp.16-7.

272. "Rochetam Burgi fortis cum toto eius vicariatu ultra padum."
A. Bertolotti, I Comuni e le Parrocchie della Provincia Mantovana, Mantova, 1893, p.17.

273. Mazzoldi, op.cit., p.3.

274. op.cit., p.12.

275. ibid.

276. Gian Lucido died in February 1448 (op.cit., p.13, note 40).
Lodovico took over Cavriana, Volta, Geresara, Rodigo, Piubega, Castellaro, S. Martino Gusnago etc.(Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.56). Alessandro died in January 1466 (Mazzoldi, op.cit., p.26).

277. Mazzoldi, op.cit., p.11.

278. C. d'Arco, Studi Intorno al Municipio di Mantova, Mantova,

1871-74, Vol.IV, p.145. In the event of war, people were allowed to hold 3 months' supply of provisions. Amadei (op.cit., Vol.II, p.149) noted that, after the flood of October 1467, grain was shifted to stores in the castles of Quistello, Revere, Sermide and Gonzaga.

279. See above, Chapter II, note 71.

280. See above, Chapter II, p.38 and note 75.

281. See above, Chapter II, note 76. Schivenoglia (op.cit., p. 124) wrote of the year 1450, "El Marchexo tolse el porto de Po, el dacio de Revere in si e molte altre traversie et daxij de Mantoana e chosij se lavorava fortemente al palazzo chi e in lo chastello de Revere." He implies a link between the work on the palace and the establishment of the customs post and obligatory crossing place.

282. Doc.121, and see above, Chapter II, note 77.

283. P. Carpeggiani, "Decadenza delle Ville Gonzaghesche", L'Arte, n.6, 1969, pp.119-39.

284. op.cit., p.136, note 4.

285. Marani (1961, p.78) noted the arms of the Compagnoni-Giorgi family on capitals of the courtyard columns and wrote of "La Ghirardina" that it was "...di fondazione non gonzaghesca."

286. As has been seen, the castle possessed a granary (Doc.46).
The vicar of Revere had built a salt store on 15th May
1453. He intended to have it paved (Doc.119).

287. Lodovico proposed to use Revere for this purpose also on
26th August 1458. He wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg from
Milan with instructions that Donatello, who was expected
to arrive in the Mantovano from Siena where the plague was
suspected, should submit to quarantine at Revere (W. Brag-
hirolli, "Donatello a Mantova", Giornale di Erudizione
Artistica, Vol.II, 1873, pp.7-8).

Schivenoglia (op.cit., p.154) wrote that, during the plague
of 1463, certain places were reserved for the members of
the Mantuan court and were forbidden to Mantuan citizens.
They were, "Ostia, Revere, Quistelo, Gonzaga, Borgoforte,
Governolo con tuto el Seraio, Marmirolo, Goito, Chavriana,
e Marcharia." When the plague began in April 1468, Lodovico
went to Goito, Barbara went to S. Giorgio and Federigo
went to Revere (op.cit., p.159).

288. That the castle was like a small town in itself may be
inferred from Document 237. During the plague, the popul-
ation of the castle was kept separate from that of the
town.

289. See below, p.239ff.

Another function of the palace, related insofar as it also
involved temporary habitation, was as a school house.

E. Faccioli (Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.II, p.74) writes that Gian Francesco Soardi supervised the education of Lodovico's children, and for some months after 20th May 1460 they stayed in the castle at Revere.

290. The Commentaries of Pius II, Gragg & Gabel, Bk.II, p.184ff.
291. Cardinal Roteno expressed interest in the stone used in the palace. He may well have been particularly impressed by the columns (Doc.223, of 28th January 1460).
292. See below, Chapter VII, Part 1.
293. L. Sissa (in Brizeghel, op.cit.) called it "...un sontuoso palazzo per residenza estive."
294. E. Battisti ("Il Mantegna e la Letteratura Classica", Arte, Pensiero e Cultura ... a Mantova..., pp.23-56) identifies a castle on the Po, that contained a cycle of paintings of mythological and literary subjects, described in a poem by Battista Fiera, as Revere. One room was decorated with a picture of Venus and nymphs dancing round a fountain. Another showed Ulysses and a Bacchanal. Mantegna is credited with the works. Battisti writes, "La descrizione poetica permette ... di valutare l'importanza della vegetazione e del tema di natura nella decorazione del palazzo." The motif of greenness that appears in the poem in connection with a room whose soffit was decorated with plant forms,

"...corrisponde al carattere della villa, alle soglie della campagna e lontana dalla capitale..."(p.25).

295. C. Eubel, Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi, Regensburg, 1914, Vol.II, p.265.

296. Perhaps there is an indication of Lodovico's ambition for Revere as a town in his decision to establish the Franciscan monastery of S. Lodovico Re di Francia. It was sited adjacent to the castle, on the west side. See above, Chapter II, note 47. Work on the castle and palace would be associated with such an ambition, as it was with the establishment of the customs post. See above, note 281. There does seem to have been a policy of encouragement of people to settle in the territory in the middle of the 15th century. See, Doc.49 and, Chapter II, note 78. As has been seen, Flavio Biondo wrote that in 1459 Revere was a "nova terra" (Chapter II, note 80).

297. For example, his treasurer, Albertino de' Pavesi, held office in Mantua. He supplied metal to the work at Revere, e.g. Docs.72,76.

298. An example of this type of castle is Soncino, built from 1473 to 1475. It is a four-square building of squatter appearance than Revere. Massive masonry counterscarps buttress the very hefty windowless walls. Three square-plan towers and one circular one stand out from the enceinte.

Crenellations are machicolated. A drawbridge with ravelin and moat cut off the building from the surrounding land (L. Beltrami, Soncino e Torre Pallavicina, Milano, 1898).

299. See, H. Hann & A. Renger-Putsch, Hohenstaufenburgen in Suditalien, Ingelheim-am-Rhein, 1961.

300. C. Perogalli ("Borghi Fortificati tra le provincie di Brescia e Mantova", Atti del XIV Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura, Brescia, Mantova, Cremona, 12-19 Sett. 1965, Roma, 1972, pp.83-93) distinguishes the Scaligeri castle, which was a fortress, and the Visconti castle, which was partly residential.

301. Pandino was begun in 1379 by Regina, the wife of Bernabo Visconti, according to C. Perogalli & G. Bascape, Castelli della Pianura Lombarda, Milano, 1967, p.185.

302. Anselmino de Folenghi wrote to Lodovico from Revere on 28th January, giving an account of the visit of the Cardinals Roteno and Santo Sixto: "In summa concludere che mai SS. non vidette il ... piu superbo palazzo di quello de la V. Ill.^{ma} S. di Mantua." (Doc.223). 'Superbo' is a word that conflates height and pride in Alberti's advice in *De Re* (IX, 2) that, "Exaggeratio cavendum est ne multo superbio sit quam vicini aedificii cohesio postulet." (Bonelli/Portoghesi, p.791). See, J. Onians, "Alberti and Filarete", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.34, 1971, p.100.

303. A. Luzio ("I Corradi di Gonzaga di Mantova", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Fasc.XXXVIII, Anno XL, Milano, 1913, pp.179-83) published documents relating to the building of the castle. He believed that work began soon after 1390, when a Papal Bull permitted Francesco Gonzaga to demolish the church of S. Maria di Capo di Bove that stood on the site for the castle, provided that he built another church. In 1393, Francesco received permission to provide a chapel in the Duomo instead. This change, Luzio suggested, was because Francesco had spent too much money on the castle. See also, S. Davari, Notizie Topografiche..., p.27.
304. See, for example, G. Paccagnini, Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.I, Mantova, 1960 (with preface by C. Gnudi), p.159.
305. A. Romanini, L'Architettura Gotica in Lombardia, Milano, 1964, Vol.II, p.146.
306. C. Calzecchi Onesti, Il Castello di Pavia, Roma, 1934, pp. 5-6: "...sebbene il castello di Pavia non sia stato concepito come pure opera di fortificazione, ma sopra tutto come palazzo, tuttavia ebbe e non poteva non avere, importanti caratteristiche militare per struttura sua propria e ancor più per posizione."
307. E. Rocchi, Le Fonti Storiche dell'Architettura Militare, Roma, 1908, p.33: "...un modello dello stile e delle disposizioni difensive dell'epoca."

308. Rocchi, op.cit., p.2: "la fortificazione è essenzialmente, per necessità storica, arte pratica."
309. A. Romanini (op.cit., p.313) took a similar view. She wrote that in the second half of the 14th century the castle "...assume valore per così dire simbolico."
310. Alberti, De Re', V, 4: "...minax aspera rigidaque sit oportet pervicax invicta."(Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.I, p.351).
311. S. von Moos (Die Kastelltyp-Variationen des Filarete, Zurich, 1971, p.18) believes that Filarete's job at the Castello Sforzesco in Milan was to make it a symbol of Francesco's authority.
312. A certain nobility attached to the employment of towers in Filarete's view. He wrote, "...poi li cantoni per piu bellezza et anche perche consegna la forma e qualita. Io fo due come quasi fussono torre..."(Pk.XI, f.84v.). This was in connection with the house for a gentleman. H. Saalman ("Early Renaissance Architectural Theory and Practice in Filarete's 'Trattato di architettura'", Art Bulletin, Vol.41, 1959, pp.89-106) remarks upon the near-interchangeability of the terms 'beauty' and 'strength' in Filarete's treatise.
313. T. Magnuson ("Studies in Roman Quattrocento Architecture", Figura, no.7, Stockholm, 1958) describes the Roman palace

of the 15th century as a building indebted to the feudal castle of the nobility. With its courtyard loggia and gardens it was "...non-urban in character and more akin to the fortified country villa or manor."(p.344). The palace at Revere also combines these qualities -though it is actually reminiscent of a town house, whilst the Roman palace was a town house by virtue of its location rather than by virtue of its form or arrangement.

314. A stretch of about six feet of brickwork from which intonaco has fallen, behind the crenellations of the north facade, is unbroken by fissures that would indicate in-filling. Pressure arches enclose the windows in the open crenellations. These are almost certainly original.
315. Filarete's house of a gentleman (Bk.XI, f.84v.) and his palace for a bishop, canons and priests (Bk.IX, f.66r.&v.), also have towers that do not step forward from the walls.
316. Giuliano da Sangallo placed the windows similarly at Poggio a Caiano.
317. See, T. Magnuson, op.cit., pp.230-41. Figure 31 shows old drawings from which it is evident that there was a similar flatness of exterior surface.
318. Filarete/Spencer, f.100r. See above, Chapter III, note 151.

319. See, for example, Commentaries of Pius II, Gragg & Gabel, Ek.V, p.396, "Pius often rested in these meadows (near Tivoli) by bubbling springs or under the shade of trees, talking with the cardinals..."
320. L. Heydenreich ("La Villa: Genesi e Sviluppi fino a Palladio", Palladio, Vol.XI, 1969, p.12) identifies three types of villa of which the first is the 'villa-castello', "...alle cui origini sta un fortilizio, che viene illeggiadrito e trasformato in 'luogo di delizia'". Vasari's remarks that the villa at Caffaggiolo -not dissimilar from the villa at Careggi, Heydenreich's first example of this type- was "ridotta a guisa di fortezza"(Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.II, p. 442) and the fact that at Revere -Heydenreich's second example- the fortified aspect of the palace was, rather, added, than the palace-aspect accommodated to the castle-aspect, suggests that, on the contrary, the 'luogo di delizia' was given the appearance of a castle. Both buildings seem to be shying away from the form of the villa.
321. See above, note 293.
322. See above, note 294.
323. Alberti, De Re', IX, 2: "Est et genus quoddam aedificii privati, quod una aedium urbanarum dignitatem et villae iocunditates exigit ...Hi sunt orti suburbani..."(Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.II, p.791).

Filarete admired houses that, although built in the country, would grace a city. The distinction between town house and country house is unclear in his observation, "...di fuori della citta ancora et palazzi et altri casamenti degnissimi che in ogni hornata citta starebbono bene. Quello di Careggi e nel Mugello in piu luoghi sparti si ne vede ... hordinati et stabiliti..."(Filarete/Spencer, Bk.XXV, f.186v.).

324. Galeazzo Maria Sforza wrote to his father, "Anday a Caregio pallatio bellissimo di esso Cosimo visto da ogni canto et delectatomene grandemente non mancho per la polideza di giardini, che invero sono pur troppo ligiadra cosa, quanto per il degno edificio dela casa, alle quale et per camere et per cusine et per sale et per ogni fornimento non manca piu che si faccia ad una dele belle case de questa citta..." (O. Morisani, Michelozzo Architetto, Torino, 1951, p.40; A. Venturi, Storia dell'Arte Italiana, Vol.VIII, Pt.I, Milano, 1923, p.271; C. von Fabriczy, "Michelozzo di Bartolomeo", Jahrbuch der Koniglich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, Berlin, 1904, Vol.25, pp.104-5).

325. Filarete/Spencer, Bk.XXV, f.186v. See above, note 323, for text.

326. R. Hatfield, "Some Unknown Descriptions of the Medici Palace in 1459", Art Bulletin, Vol.62, 1970, pp.232-49.

327. See, G. Baccini, Le Ville Medicee di Caffaggiolo e di

Trebbio in Mugello, Firenze, 1892; Vasari, Milanese, Vol.II, p.442. Morisani (op.cit., p.94) dates Michelozzo's works at Caffaggiolo to after 1451, when Cosimo took possession of the property (See also, von Fabriczy, 1904, p.40). It had been in Medici hands for many years. Baccini referred to a document of 1395 showing that (p.9). He wrote that Trebbio was worked on at the same time as Caffaggiolo (p.123).

328. Vasari, Milanese, Vol.II, p.442: "...ed ordinó i poderi, le strade, i giardini, e le fontane con boschi attorno, ragnaie, e altre cose da ville molto ornate."

329. G. Carocci, La Villa Medicea di Careggi, Firenze, 1888, p.15. The property came into the possession of the Medici in 1457, and works are dated to after that time (Morisani, op.cit., p.96).

330. Leonardo understands by villa, 'small holding', when he says, "Ella (the villa) ti manda a casa ora uno, ora un altro frutto, mai ti lascia la casa vota di qualche sua liberalità".(Alberti, Della Famiglia, in Opere Volgari, Vol.I, a cura di C. Grayson, Bari, 1960, p.199).

331. Alberti, Opere Volgari, Vol.I, p.195.

332. Platina (1685, p.437) emphasized Lodovico's projects to improve Mantuan agriculture. Heydenreich (1969, p.14ff)

discusses the recognition, during the period, that agriculture was a part of good government.

Chapter VI.

333. Marani lists buildings that Fancelli is documented as having worked on. In Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.II, p.84, he lists Gonzaga residences in the Mantovano: Goito (in 1468, n.105), Gonzaga (from 1468-72, n.106) and Saviola (in 1475, n.107). In "Gli edifici padronali della campagna mantovano" (in Palazzi e Ville del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, p.5, n.5), he listed more places in the country where Fancelli worked. Besides Revere, there were Sermide, Borgoforte, Villimpenta, Castellaro (Castel d'Ario), Bigarello, Due Castelli (Castelbelforte), Castiglione Mantovano, Governolo and probably Foggio Rusco. He recounts the fate of Fancelli's works (op.cit., p.5, n.3).

Braghirolli noted that Fancelli worked on fortifications at Sermide in 1482 (1876, p.619, n.37) and, in the same year, at Castiglione Mantovano, Castelbelforte, Bigarello, Villimpenta and Castellaro (1876, p.619, n.38). The extent of Fancelli's involvement with these works could only be gauged from careful study of documentary material preserved in the "Archivio di Stato di Mantova".

334. Marani, 1961, pp.79-81.

335. P. Carpeggiani, "Decadenza delle Ville Gonzaghesche", L'Arte, n.6, 1969, pp.119-39; and "Luca Fancelli architetto civile nel contado gonzaghesco", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971,

pp.37-44.

336. R. Campagnari, "La Ghirardina di Motteggiana", in Palazzi e Ville del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, pp.7-14.
337. G. dal Prato, "Una concezione di Luca Fancelli. Il Palazzo Pastore di S. Martino Gusnago", in Corti e Dimore del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1969, pp.3-11.
338. Marani, 1961, p.80.
339. See, Campagnari, op.cit. Incidentally, in the provision of a tall signorial block with lower subsidiary wings, Motteggiana resembles Filarete's merchant's house. Filarete/Spencer, f.86r.
340. For datings offered by the different authorities, see above, Chapter III, note 147. Marani identifies the arms of the Compagnoni-Giorgi family on two of the columns of the portico of "La Ghirardina"(Fig.106). Little is known about the family, insofar as knowledge might suggest a more precise dating for the building. Campagnari notes that Giacomo Compagnoni-Giorgi came to Mantua from Pavia in 1445(p.10, note 3).
- Francesco Secco provided a valuable service to Lodovico Gonzaga in the battle at Goito, where Carlo Gonzaga was

defeated in 1453. See, G.P. Arrivabene, Gonzagidos, p.32; and M. Equicola, Dell'Istoria di Mantova, Ed. F. Osanna, Mantua, 1610, p.179.

341. Marani's opinion differs. He wrote, "Per l'assieme di ciò che finora si è detto, è da ritenere che gli edifici con il coronamento a merlatura bifida chiusa e le finestre incorniciate al modo di Revere e non appoggiate a segnapiani, oppure con uno di codesti motivi, procedano dal Fancelli o siano stati da lui disegnati."(1961, p.81). Campagnari also lays weight upon the similarity in treatment of crenellations at Revere and Motteggiana. He wrote, "Nelle due costruzioni sono quasi uguali per disegno e per proporzione le merlature."(op.cit., p.7). It has already been observed, however, that the crenellations at Revere are not uniform. Those of the facade and towers are smaller and, proportionally, more distantly placed than those of the side wings. Also, the fact that a crenellation abuts the tower on the east facade, whilst an interspace is next to the tower on the west facade, suggests that the bricklayers were not under firm direction.

342. Campagnari, op.cit., p.8.

343. Campagnari's investigations of "La Chirardina" were hampered by the intonaco hiding the brickwork (op.cit., p.12).

344. Marani thinks of the arrangement of androne, hanging court-

yard and vaulted storerooms below as a derivation from sacred architecture (1961, pp.79-80). He implies a belief in the contemporaneity of the parts of the structure and perhaps hints at the influence of S. Sebastiano on the design. However, such an interpretation does not explain such differences in wall thicknesses between the ground and upper levels.

345. Campagnari, loc.cit.

346. Marani sees the building representing a single conception. He wrote, "L'esempio di Motteggiana conferma il perfetto inserimento dell'artista fiorentino (Fancelli) in un mondo padano che d'altronde egli, fin dal suo primo giungere alle sponde del Mincio, doveva avere trovato comprensibile e geniale"(1961, p.80). The idea of a single conception would apply to the utilization of old remains in the present building. That conception, however, did not perhaps include the specific decorative aspect of the building, and Fancelli may not have been responsible for Motteggiana in all respects.

347. Carpeggiani, 1969, p.138, n.16.

348. Carpeggiani (op.cit.) states succinctly a functional analysis of the parts of the building. In this, he agrees substantially with Marani and Campagnari in the sources referred to above. A glance at the building (Figs.100,103) confirms the clarity of the organization of parts.

349. Marani, 1961, p.79.

350. Vaulted loggie were relatively rare in 15th century Mantuan domestic architecture, according to Marani (1961, p.116).

351. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Vasari thought that Michelozzo distinguished himself by that skill. See, for example, Vasari's description of the Palazzo Medici, where the usefulness of the arrangement of rooms is emphasized (Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.II, pp.433-34).

352. Carpeggiani ("Luca Fancelli, architetto civile nel contado gonzaghesco", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971, pp.38-9) wrote that the windows of the facade were placed according to a rational-geometric scheme. However, he does not explain what the scheme is.

353. See, for example, the north wing at Revere and plates 156 and 157 in Marani's Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.II, 1961.

354. Marani, 1961, p.83.

355. Marani, 1961, pp.82-3. Campagnari finds visual evidence of Fancelli's activity in the Palazzo Cantoni on the via Chiassi, the Palazzo Biondi on the via Cavriani, and the house on the corner of the via Goito and the Piazza Mantegna (Palazzo Lancini). Like Marani (1961, pp.83-4), he also mentions the Palazzo del Comune at Poggio Rusco (op.cit., p.8).

356. The site was acquired in 1454. See, M. Palvarini, La Casa di Giovan Boniforte da Concorezzo -una preziosa architettura del quattrocento mantovano, Mantova, 1964, p.7. The Tuscan inscription on the cross-lintel reads: "Dominando lo Illustre/ messere Lodovigo de/ Gonzaga marchese se/ condo de Mantua Zohan/ Boniforte da Concorezzo mer/ zadro fece fare questa/ botega corendo 1455".(Marani, 1961, note 127, p.43).
357. H. Saalman, "Filippo Brunelleschi: Capital Studies", Art Bulletin, Vol.40, 1958, pp.113-37.
358. See, Saalman, op.cit., Fig.34.
359. Marani, 1961, pp.82-3.
360. See above, Chapter III, note 173.
361. Another allusion to castellated buildings that sometimes appears in Mantuan houses need not have derived from Revere. The heavy semi-circular section brick moulding that runs the length of the facade of the house of the Beata Osanna Andreasi refers to counterscarps (Fig.25). And, while recalling the mouldings used on the towers at Revere, could have derived from examples in the city, like the Castel di S. Giorgio.
362. See, S. Davari (Notizie Storiche Topografiche..., 1903,

pp.35-6) and Marani (1961, pp.81-2) for an account of relevant documents (See also, Doc.231.). It is not known if any of the earlier structure, pre-dating Revere, were provided with filled crenellations.

363. A. Bertolotti, Architetti, Ingegneri e Matematici in relazione coi Gonzaga ... nei secoli XV, XVI, XVII, Genova, 1889, p.10, letter from Lodovico, in Milan, to Barbara, 15th June 1462. For letter of 10th August 1462, see, S. Davari, 1890, p.15, note 2; and A. Luzio, 1922, p.180, note 3.

364. Marani (loc.cit.) depreciates the work, calling it "scialbo e monotono". He attributes it to Gian Antonio.

365. Marani believes that blind crenellations continued to be applied to buildings until about 1465, when round windows began to be opened at attic level in friezes between architrave bands and cornices (1961, p.164).

366. See, Marani, op.cit., pp.21-3 and pp.162-66.

367. In fact, bevel-recessed windows, characteristic of the older parts of the palace at Revere, continued to be used in Mantua -though in somewhat more rudimentary form, with square rather than semi-circular section framing bands. e.g. the house of the Beata Andreasi (Fig.25) and the house of Mantegna. Of course, the tradition of that window form was rejected at Revere, where the new fenestration, execut-

ed by Fancelli and his assistants, passed from the north facade down the side wings and over the older windows. The tradition of that old window's use continued at Revere, then -but only incidentally as far as the completed structure is concerned.

368. Marani, op.cit., p.85.

369. Marani, op.cit., pp.94-5.

370. Marani, op.cit., p.69.

371. A. Schivenoglia, Cronaca di Mantova..., p.125.

372. ibid.

373. Schivenoglia wrote, "El mexe de marzo 1472 l'ospedallo grando de Mantoa comenzoe alozare di povery..."(op.cit., p.168).

374. P. Foster, "Per il disegno dell'ospedale di Milano", in "Il Filarete", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 1973, pp.1-22.

375. Marani, 1961, p.69.

376. ibid.

377. ibid.

378. See, Marani, Fig.51.

379. F. Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.64; Marani, 1961, p.68.

380. J. Spencer, "Two New Documents on the Ospedale Maggiore, Milan", Arte Lombarda, Anno 16, 1971, pp.114-16; P. Foster, op.cit.

381. Foster, op.cit., p.7.

382. Spencer, op.cit., p.115.

383. Filarete/Spencer, Bk.XI, f.79r. ff, and p.137ff.

384. It is possible that Florentines advised on the layout of the slightly earlier hospitals of Brescia and Pavia. At Brescia, "Hospitale unum magnum et generale fiat Brixie sicut in civitate Senarum."(Foster, op.cit., p.7; N. Tartaglia, Storia di Brescia, Vol.II, Brescia, 1963, Pt.V, Chap. III, pp.682-83). At Pavia, the hospital was "...ad instar Florentinensis et Senensis Hospitalium."(Foster, p.7). Decorative details of the hospital that survives, that at Pavia, have a local character, but round arches, columns and spandrel roundels in the southeast cloister suggest a Tuscan influence. Of course, a Tuscan involvement with design need not have precluded execution of the whole and the parts by local builders. It is possible that, the

desire to imitate Tuscan examples having originated, apparently, outside of purely architectural circles, the study of hospitals by Tuscans and the development of the authoritative form was the work of laymen as well as architects. Giovanni de' Medici exceeded Francesco Sforza's wishes in having several masters prepare designs for the Ospedale Maggiore, in 1456 (Spencer, p.115). Perhaps his enthusiastic response to Sforza's request for a master came out of a particular interest in hospital design, and gratification that homage had been paid to a Florentine building -by Pavia, and now Milan, to say nothing of Mantua.

385. Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, in his biography of Brunelleschi, lamented alterations to Brunelleschi's original proposals for the facade of the Ospedale degli Innocenti (The Life of Brunelleschi..., Introd. H. Saalman, Trans. C. Enggass, Pennsylvania, 1970, p.97, l.1069ff.). He adopted a similar tone when criticizing the alterations to S. Lorenzo and S. Spirito after Brunelleschi's death, by his model-maker, who is to be identified with Antonio Manetti (l.1287ff.). However, while the biographer's displeasure at Brunelleschi's work being handed on to posterity in damaged form links the two parts of the narrative, the villain is not the same person in both. It is Francesco della Luna, a silk merchant and one of the operai of the Innocenti, who is blamed for damaging the hospital (C. von Fabriczy, Filippo Brunelleschi, sein Leben und seine Werke, Stuttgart, 1892, p.580; Saalman, op.cit., p.142, note 117). Here incidentally is

another case of someone who was not a professional member of the building trade taking a very particular interest in the architecture of a hospital.

386. R. Goldthwaite & W. Rearick, "Michelozzo and the Ospedale di San Paolo in Florence", Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Instituts in Florenz, Band XXI, Heft 3, 1977, pp.221-306.

The writers publish four documents, two undated and two of 1459, referring to Michelozzo as capomaestro of the works on the Ospedale di S. Paolo. He may have worked there as early as 1456 (p.238).

387. Spencer, op.cit., p.114.

388. Admittedly, this is not the only reading of the letter that is possible. Why did the writer use "per" before "ospedale" rather than "del"? There is perhaps the implication that, as yet, no formal relationship had been established between the hospital and the engineer. In that case, the engineer was making a first journey to Milan in connection with the hospital. However, "lo inzegniere per l'ospedale dal laghetto" reads as a single phrase rather than two, with a pause between "inziengiero" and "per". There, is support for the reading that the engineer had journeyed from Milan to Florence.

389. Letter of 4th June 1456. M. Lazzaroni & A. Munoz, Filarete, scultore e architetto del secolo XV, Roma, 1903, p.186;

See, Foster, p.9.

390. The Pope gave permission for building in May 1451. See, Foster, p.8.

391. Spencer, p.114.

392. Filarete/Spencer, Bk.XI, f.79r. "Et lui impostomi questo ch'io dovessi fare uno disegno, imprima mi domando s'io avevo veduto quello di firenze, o quello di Siena et se io mi ricordavo come stavano, dissi che si. Volle vedere uno certo congetto del fondamento et io cosi lineato come meglio mi ricordavo, gliene disegniai uno come quello di firenze pur parendo allui non essere si idonio come lui avrebbe voluto et ancora per vantaggiare glialtri stava pur sospeso."

393. See above, note 389.

394. In fact, there is a certain confusing profusion of Antonios in the north of Italy at the time. In a letter of 20th December 1451 to Piero de' Medici, Filarete referred to an Antonio who had been to Milan and would speak to Piero (Lazzaroni, Munoz, p.144). Antonio Manetti must have been in the Mantovano on 10th December, for Lodovico promised his services to the counts of Mirandola (Doc.107). A 'Maestro Antonio da Firenze' was imprisoned in Milan on 15th August 1454 for the murder of Francesco Filelfo's

daughter, Pantea, and his son-in-law. He was released at Christmas 1457 (Lazzaroni, Munoz, p.182).

395. Spencer, op.cit., p.115.

396. ibid.

397. See above, note 392.

398. See, P. Carpeggiani, "Congruenze e parallelismi nell'architettura lombarda della seconda metà del '400; Il Filarete e Luca Fancelli", in "Il Filarete", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 1973, pp.53-69.

399. See above, Chapter III, note 151.

400. G. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, pp.194-5, Doc.LXXVIII, letter to the Signoria of Florence from Francesco Sforza, 13th March 1460. Incidentally, Lodovico Gonzaga was in Milan on 9th February 1460 (Marani, 1961, p.20) and on 1st April (Doc.226).

401. Filarete/Spencer, f.44v. The names of Michelozzo and Bernardo Rossellino appear. Filarete did refer to an Antonio who worked at Pisa. However, he was almost certainly not Manetti for he was mentioned among non-Florentines.

402. Manetti made out his will on 11th October 1460. Gaye, op.cit. p.171.

403. See above, notes 384, 387, 392.

404. Foster, p.5.

405. op.cit., p.4.

406. op.cit., Fig.13.

407. op.cit., p.8.

408. Filarete/Spencer, Bk.XI, f.79r. "...gli (Francesco Sforza) pareva innanzi si cominciassse intendere molto bene et vedere accio fusse bello et hutile a simile bisogno d'infermi d'huomini et di donne et anche di questi putti i quali nascono indirettamente."

409. Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.64.

410. Also at the Innocenti, in Florence, there was a social division of function. At the ends of the facade, there were "entrate degli uomini e delle donne." E. Mendes Manuel & G. Dallai, "Nuove indagini sullo spedale degli Innocenti a Firenze", Commentari, XVII, 1966, p.87 & p.92.
In 15th century Florence, however, hospital provisions were not all concentrated. There were many independent hospitals in the city. See, Goldthwaite & Rearick, op.cit., p.224.

411. A. Romanini ("Un nuovo complesso di tavolette da soffitto

quattrocentesche ritrovate a Pavia", Arte Lombarda, Anno IV, 1959, pp.58-66) and C. Saletti ("La fabbrica quattrocentesca dell'Ospedale di San Matteo in Pavia", Arte Lombarda, Anno V, 1960, pp.48-55) see a first incursion of Tuscan influence into Pavia in the oldest, southeast, cloister of the hospital. It is two-storeyed. On the lower level, round arches with terracotta archivolts are supported by columns resting on a low parapet. The porticos are cross-vaulted. Roundels framed simply in terracotta occupy the spandrels of the arches. (Roundels, it must be said, are not uniquely Tuscan features of decoration.

H. Klotz, in fact, suggests that Brunelleschi may have adopted the motif for the Innocenti from the Cappella S. Felice in S. Antonio in Padua. See, Die Fruhwerke Brunelleschis und die Mittelalterliche Tradition, Berlin, 1970, p.139.)

A terracotta course above the arches of the lower arcade marks the floor level above, and the parapet supporting the columns of the lower level is also given emphasis. The upper level columns support round arches, and the walkway is trabeated. While these features of the cloister signify a debt to Tuscan building, the treatment of decorative features betrays the presence of local craftsmen. Both Romanini and Saletti write of "Gothic contamination of Renaissance structure."

412. Amadei (op.cit., p.64) listed the governors of the Ospedale di S. Leonardo. All but the Marquis of Mantua were clerics. They were, the Bishop of Mantua, the Abbot of S. Andrea,

the Abbot of S. Benedetto Po, the 'archiprete', provost and prior of the Cathedral, the Prior of S. Domenico, the Prior of the Certosa and the Principal of the Minor Observants of S. Francesco (op.cit., p.64).

413. L. Volta (Compendio cronologico-critico della storia di Mantova, Mantova, 1827, Vol.II, p.130) wrote that the overseer of the work was Giovanni Almerici da Pesaro, the podestà.
414. Amadei, loc.cit.
415. A. Possevino, Historia de Famiglia Gonzaga, Mantua, MDCXXVIII, pp.605-6.
416. He was called "nostro inzierno" in a letter of 5th December 1459 to the vicar of Dosolo. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop. Lib.31, f.37v. See also, Cop.Lib.31, f.51r., of 19th February 1460; and Cop.Lib.28, f.95v., of 9th September 1458. See also, A. Bertolotti (1889, p.17) for other notices of Giovanni Tomario.
417. Foster (op.cit.) wondered if the Ospedale di S. Leonardo was not the first regular Greek cross plan hospital. However, he did not give reasons for doubting that S. Matteo was earlier in the sequence. Though begun earlier, the hospital at Pavia was, like S. Leonardo, built over a long period of time. In 1458, it was described as "...iam fundatum et pro parte edificatum et in qui magna cotidie

fabricantur."(Saletti, op.cit., p.49). Questions of priority are not easily answered. The upper floor of S. Matteo existed in 1471 and the women's hospital was finished in 1489.

418. Filarete/Spencer, f.59r. See above, Chapter I, note 32.

419. H. Saalman ("Tommaso Spinelli, Michelozzo, Manetti and Rossellino", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.XXV, no.3, 1966, pp.151-64), for example, observes that Rossellino's work after 1455 in the Spinelli Cloister of S. Croce is barely distinguishable from the work of Manetti and Michelozzo.

420. W. & E. Paatz, Die Kirche von Florenz, Vol.II, Darmstadt, 1955, p.525. Saalman (op.cit., p.151) sees Manetti working on the cloister of S. Lorenzo with or without a design by Michelozzo.

421. L. Gori-Montanelli (Brunelleschi e Michelozzo, Firenze, 1957, p.100) associates cloister arches without extrados mouldings with Michelozzo, as opposed to Brunelleschi. However, if Manetti did work in the cloister of S. Lorenzo, and this is a genuine characteristic of Michelozzo's work, the cloister at the Ospedale di S. Leonardo would represent an awkward contradiction -for it would be necessary to see a Brunelleschian characteristic there.

422. A. Bertolotti, Architetti, Ingegneri e Matematici...,

Genoa, 1889, p.7ff. See also, Marani, 1961, p.159.

423. Manetti's visits to Mantua were periodic. He was called "nostro ingegniero" in a letter, of 10th December 1451, to the counts of Mirandola (Doc.107).

424. Aristotele straightened a leaning tower at the Porta Cerese in Mantua in spring 1459. L. Beltrami, Vita di Aristotele da Bologna, Milano, 1912, p.42ff. Spencer (Filarete/ Spencer, p.180, note 7) refers to a letter of 1457. In it, Aristotele was called Lodovico's engineer.

425. See, W. Braghirolli, "Leon Battista Alberti a Mantova", Archivio Storico Italiano, Ser.II, Vol.IX, 1869.

426. G. Pacchioni, "L'Opera di Luciano Laurana a Mantova", Bollettino d'Arte, 1923-4, pp.97-111; C. Cottafavi, "Ricerche e Documenti sulle Costruzioni del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova dal Secolo XIII al Secolo XIX", Atti e Memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, N.S., Vol.XXV, 1939, pp.171-229. (See also, A. Luzio, "La Galleria dei Gonzaga Venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-8", Milano, 1913, p.21, note 2. See also, G. Franceschini, Figure del Rinascimento Urbinate, Urbino, 1959, p.85, for Ottaviano degli Ubaldini's letter to Lodovico, of 20th March 1466.).

427. Braghirolli, 1869, p.14. See also, G. Mancini, Vita di Leon

Battista Alberti, Roma, 1970 (Reprint of 1911 Edition),
p.487 and pp.326-7.

428. Testimony to the fame of Mantuan hydraulic engineers, for example, is to be found in a letter of 24th April 1469 from the King of Sicily to Lodovico Gonzaga. The King wanted to drain marshes and wrote, "...intendendo como voi ne haviti de boni (water engineers), pregamone ne vogliati compiacere de uno de dicti mastri..." In reply to this request for an engineer, Lodovico sent "francesco inzignero", for whose services the King sent a letter of thanks on 19th October 1469. A. Bertolotti, 1889, pp.12-13.
429. Regarding Giovanni's work in Naples in 1471, see, A. Bertolotti, 1889, pp.14-15; and A. Luzio, L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, Verona, 1922, p.165. It was on his journey between Mantua and Naples that he stopped off at Florence and reported on the work at SS. Annunziata to Lodovico.
430. In 1485. A. Bertolotti, op.cit., p.16; Luzio, op.cit., p.192.
431. See above, Chapter III, note 149.
432. On the death of Giuliano da Maiano in 1490, Luca Fancelli was sent down to Naples as a replacement. See, Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, pp.300-4, Docs. CXXXVIII and CXXXIX, the one undated, the other of 16th December 1490.

Luca wrote to Francesco Gonzaga on 13th May 1491, from Naples, that he had provided designs for the Castel Capuano. See, d'Arco, Delle Arti e degli Artefici di Mantova, Mantova, 1857, Vol.II, p.27, Doc.33; and Braghirolli, 1876, p.634, Doc.XVI.

433. G. Campori (Gli Architetti e gli Ingegneri Civili e Militari degli Estensi, Modena, 1882, p.11) noted that Giampietro received 20 gold florins from Borso d'Este in 1456, for work at Bagnocavallo. A letter of 29th July 1459 mentions Figino, who had returned from Ferrara, where he had been working for the Duke of Modena. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.33v.
434. A. Bertolotti, Figuli, Fonditori e Scultori ... di Mantova..., Milano, 1890, p.63; M. Salmi, "Il Campanile della Cattedrale di Ferrara", Commentari, Vol.13, 1962, p.81.
435. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2882, Cop.Lib.10, f.93r, n.368.
436. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.14, f.59v, n.510.
437. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, f.23r, n.250.
438. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.17, f.14v, n.125.
439. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.19, f.21r, n.162.

440. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.27, f.81r.

441. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.30, f.7r.

442. Bertolotti (1890, p.67) gave notice of Sandri being gravely ill in 1471 and of Francesco working at Saviola in 1475. See also, Braghirolli, 1876, p.616, note 18. On 23rd May 1462, Lodovico Gonzaga wrote to Antonio da Ricavo in Florence, instructing him to persuade Sandri ("cognato de Luca nostro tagliapetra") to come to Mantua (Braghirolli, 1869, p.9, note 3).

443. Luca Fancelli mentioned him in a letter of 2nd December 1464 from Rome. He wrote to Lodovico, "...se possibile a far che Nicholo mio garzone abia quelli 50 fiorini per andar alla montagna a chavar le pietre vive per la porta di S. Sebastiano" (F. Rodolico, Le Pietre delle Città d'Italia, Firenze, 1953, pp.142-44). Regarding Petro, see above, Chapter IV, note 214. Document 175, of 10th January 1458, shows that at one time Fancelli had six assistants.

444. Bertolotti, 1890, p.64; and Marani, 1961, p.48.

445. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, p.197, Doc.LXXX, of 8th November 1462. See also, d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, Doc.9, pp.10-11; Bertolotti, 1890, pp.63-4.

446. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.20, f.23v.

447. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.27, f.1r.

448. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.38, f.55r.

449. It was Barbara to whom Marco Zoppo wrote on 16th September 1462, on the subject (Braghirolli, Lettere Inediti di Artisti del sec. XV cavate dall'Archivio Gonzaga, Mantova, 1878, p.9. See also, E. Ruhmer, Marco Zoppo, Vicenza, 1966, p.12, note 1). Perhaps it was a legitimate female interest.

450. Marani, 1961, p.170, note 36.

451. A.S.M.A.G. Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.46r. Documents 205 and 206 show that the engineer and the carpenter were the same person. Gian Antonio da Rezo "marangone" and "inzi gnero" was perhaps the same person as "Johannem Antonium filium Manfredini marangoni" who, in October 1450, charged the miniaturist, Belbello da Pavia, with sodomy (G. Facchioni, "Belbello da Pavia e Gerolamo da Cremona, miniatori", L'Arte, 1915, Doc.5, p.369). See also, Bertolotti, 1889, p.10.

452. Bertolotti, 1890, pp.12-13.

453. See, A. Ricci, Storia dell'Architettura in Italia dal Secolo IV al XVII, Modena, 1858, Vol.II, p.680, note 116; Braghirolli, 1878, Doc.III, pp.13-14. He was similarly described in the 1480 Register (d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, p.13, note 5). Lodovico, in a letter to Luca from Goito, of

28th June 1475, called him an engineer in connection with work at S. Sebastiano (Braghirolli, 1869, Doc.XIII, p.25).

454. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.VIII, p.628.

455. Braghirolli, 1869, p.14. See also, G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, p.487.

456. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.38, f.21r.

457. d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, p.15.

458. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2390.

459. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.15, f.7r, n.44.

460. Bertolotti, 1889, p.9. On 13th February 1450, Lodovico allowed him an extension of time for the transportation of his goods to Mantua.

461. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, n.260.

462. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, n.894.

463. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.20, f.10r.

464. Bertolotti, 1889, p.9.

465. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, n.758.
466. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.15, f.74r, n.478, and f.87v, n.594.
467. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.21, f.29r.
468. d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, Doc.6, pp.8-9, letter of 15th February 1458, from Lodovico to Francesco d'Arco, referring to work at Monferrato and unnamed works elsewhere. See also, Bertolotti, 1889, p.11.
469. Lodovico wrote to Giampietro from Petriolo, near Siena, on 20th May 1460. See, Fraghirolli, 1869, p.20.
Marani (1961, p.120) observes that his involvement with the project coincided with Fancelli's absence in Florence.
However, being called an engineer before that time, it is possible that Giampietro's role at S. Sebastiano was not unimportant compared with Luca's.
470. U. Rossi, "Cristoforo Geremia", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, Roma, 1888, p.405.
471. See, Bertolotti, 1889, p.12ff.
472. G. Fiocco ("Andrea Mantegna e il Brunelleschi", Atti del 1^o Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura, Firenze, 1938, pp.179-83; and Mantegna (French ed. Trans.

J. Chuzeville), Milano, 1937, p.114) associated Giovanni da Padova with projects upon which Mantegna was also engaged -the chapel of the Castel di S. Giorgio and Mantegna's own house. Regarding Mantegna's house, see, P. Kristeller, Mantegna, London, 1901, p.203ff.

473. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.26, f.40v.

474. Marani, 1961, p.159. Not all these works were done during Lodovico's marquisate. See, Bertolotti, 1889, pp.15-17.

475. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.29, f.91r.

476. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.61v. The part of this letter that concerned S. Sebastiano was published by Braghirolli (1869, p.9, note 2). Marani (1961, p.31) refers to extensive works under way in 1461, on the Rocca at Cavriana and on fortifications at Goito.

477. Platina (1722, p.201) referred to this canal. S. Davari (I Palazzi del Antico Comune di Mantova..., Mantova, 1888, p.15 (Estratto di Atti della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova)) also referred to it.

478. Document 233 refers to 'Zohane' in connection with preparations for Lodovico's reception at Borgoforte and elsewhere. Document 180 refers to 'Magistro Zohanne' in whose company Lodovico inspected fireplaces and the front door at Revere

(See above, Chapter IV, p.108 where this document is also discussed.).

479. Bertolotti, 1889, pp.10-11.

480. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.37v. See also, f.51r.
a letter of 19th February 1460.

481. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.28, f.41r.

482. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.28, f.95v.

483. Bertolotti, 1889, p.17.

484. L. Beltrami, Vita di Aristotele da Bologna, Milano, 1912,
p.42ff. See also, Schivenoglia, Cronaca di Mantova..., p.134.

485. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.37, f.88r.&v.

486. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2882, Cop.Lib.13, n.315.

487. E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.II, p.31. See also,
F. Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.88.

488. Faccioli, loc.cit.

489. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.15, f.17r, n.96, and f.41v,
n.198.

490. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.17, n.514.

491. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.19, f.165r.&v.

492. Perhaps because of this ambiguity concerning some people's roles, Marani (1961, p.160) includes Albertino de' Pavese among engineers employed by Lodovico.

493. Schivenoglia (op.cit., p.126) referred to this work: "Adj 7 de setembre 1451 fo prinzipiato la rocheta dala porta de la pradella molto in freza..." An insurrection, led by Matteo da Vicenza and fomented by dissatisfaction with plague regulations, had recently been attempted. The building was associated with this event. See, Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.71.

494. This may be the same as Corpus Domini, which Marani identifies as the monastery of S. Paolo (1961, p.16).

495. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2591. The sender was called Luca. His second name is indecipherable.

496. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2882, Cop.Lib.13, n.290.

497. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2882, Cop.lib.13, n.377.

498. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2882, Cop.Lib.10, n.368.

499. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.15, n.268.

500. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, n.758.

501. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.30, f.34v. To Albertino
de' Pavesi.

502. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.51.

503. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.16, n.260.

504. See above, note 462.

505. See above, note 463.

506. See above, note 438.

507. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2883, Cop.Lib.17, n.275.

508. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.21, f.29r.

509. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.29, f.91r.

510. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2390.

511. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.30, f.77, 16th October,
and f.79r, 17th October.

512. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2884, Cop.Lib.28, f.101r.
513. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2390.
514. A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2393.
515. Regarding hydraulic works, which are outside the scope of this discussion, see, d'Arco, Studi Intorno al Municipio di Mantova, Mantova, 1871-74, Vol.IV, p.164ff.
516. See above, note 379.
517. Amadei (Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.35) dated the start of the work to 1443. Marani (1961, p.15, note 5) dates the start to 1444.
518. Amadei, op.cit., p.82-3.
519. d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, p.8, Doc.5.
520. Amadei, op.cit., pp.115-17.
521. Braghirolli, 1876, p.614, note 15. Marani identifies Fancelli's work in the three-aisled refectory (1961, p.70).
522. Schivenoglia, op.cit., p.154; G. Intra, "La Basilica di S. Sebastiano", Arte e Storia, Vol.II, 1883; Braghirolli, 1869, p.9ff; V. Matteucci, Le Chiese Artistiche del

del Mantovano, Mantova, 1902, p.167ff.

523. D. Chambers, "Sant' Andrea at Mantua and Gonzaga Patronage 1460-1472", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.XL, 1977, pp.99-127. Chamber does not maintain that his point is a conclusive one. However, his suggestion is attractive.
524. See below, Chapter VII, note 676.
525. G. Paccagnini, Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.I, p.28 and p.88.
See also, C. Battaglia, La Rotonda di San Lorenzo in Mantova, Mantova, 1955.
526. See, Marani, 1961, pp.87-91.
527. Matteucci, op.cit., p.68; d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, Doc.15, p.15; Gaye, op.cit., Vol.I, p.263.
528. The above letter contains a reference to the dome of the chapel. Vasari, Milanesi, Vol.III, pp.396-7. Mantegna referred to the gilding of the frames in a letter to Lodovico, of 26th April 1464 (Kristeller, op.cit., Doc.13, p.471).
529. The building fund for S. Andrea was opened on 27th April 1471 (See, G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, p.487).
By a papal brief, Lodovico received the patronage rights

over the church, and the papal treasury contributed 1.000 florins for the building work (Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.188). Regarding the Ospedale di S. Leonardo, see above, note 414.

530. In his letter to Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga, of 2nd January 1472, Lodovico sought the Pope's permission to demolish and build at the Piazza Mantegna end of the church. The area to be covered by the new church would be different from that covered by the extant building. Lodovico wanted to proceed "come pare a lui" (d'Arco, 1857, Vol.II, Doc.13, pp.12-13). His correspondence with Alberti on the subject shows that he was actively concerned with the design of the new building. See, Chambers (op.cit.), for evidence that it was for a long time before 1470 that Lodovico was ambitious to build at S. Andrea.

531. Although there was an oratory on the site, or nearby (I. Donesmondi, Dell'Istoria Ecclesiastica di Mantova, Mantova, 1612-16, Vol.I, p.178; A. Schiavi, Il restauro della chiesa di S. Sebastiano di Leon Battista Alberti in Mantova, Mantova, 1932, p.7, gives the above reference.), the church was built from foundations. Perhaps the lack of community interest in the work may be inferred from the fact that, as a quite new church, it was not consecrated during the earlier part of its long period of construction. Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga wrote, on 16th March 1473, that it was "...né consecrato né abituato al culto divino"

(C. von Fabriczy, "Die Baugeschichte von San Sebastiano in Mantua", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.XXVII, 1904, p.84). And, in a decree of 22nd September 1488, Francesco Gonzaga saw the need for the building to be given to some religious group (S. Davari, "Ancora della chiesa di S. Sebastiano di Mantova e di Luca Fancelli", Rassegna d'Arte, n.6, 1901, p.94). Braghirolli (1879, p.259) wrote that the church was built at Lodovico's expense.

532. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.VIII, p.628.

533. It may be noted that Filarete had Lodovico, in his speech about his conversion to the 'ancient style' and his acquisition of a Florentine's services, refer to more than one building for which models were made. These were buildings for his own devotion (Filarete/Spencer, f.99v.). The chapel of the Castel di S. Giorgio is an obvious candidate. S. Sebastiano may have been another.

534. See, Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, pp.72-3.

535. Braghirolli, 1876, p.617, note 12, letter of 27th August 1463, from Luca, at Mantua, to Lodovico. See also, Luca's letter of 22nd February 1477, to Lodovico. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.VIII, p.628. Fancelli worked on the soffitt, which does not, however, survive (Braghirolli, 1876, p.616; Marani, p.70).

536. Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.205.

537. S. Davari, Notizie storiche topografiche..., pp.35-6;

See also, Marani, 1961, pp.81-2. This was probably the first architectural project that was part of the repristination of the area, and involved the paving of streets and squares. Regarding proposals for this area of the city, see, M. dall'Acqua, "Storia di un progetto albertiano non realizzato: la ricostruzione della Rotonda di San Lorenzo in Mantova", in Il Sant' Andrea di Mantova e Leon Battista Alberti, 1974, pp.229-36.

538. See above, note 363.

539. The building is usually dated to about 1470. See, Marani, 1961, p.85. However, in his letter of 22nd February 1477, Fancelli mentioned the Torre del Orologio among works done between 1450 and 1466. Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.VIII, p.628.

540. Braghirolli, 1869, p.13. For the text of the inscription, see, F. Tarducci, "Gian Francesco Gonzaga, Signore di Mantova (1407-1420). Studi e Ricerche", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XXIX, 1902, p.316, note 1.

541. Amadei (Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.197) wrote that the Torre del Orologio and the Casa del Mercato, with its portico joining the Torre and the Palazzo Vecchio, were begun in 1473. Schivenoglia (op.cit., p.173) wrote, "Hora

nota che le lano 1473 lo Ill. Sior. mes. lo marchexo mes. Lodovigo da Gonzaga chomenzoe a fare la chaxa de lo merchato in mantoa..." Marani (1961, p.31, note 101) notes that a start of building was made in 1474. As early as 11th December 1471, Lodovico wrote to Albertino de' Pavesi, "... Nui certo havemo facto questo pensere, de fare fare la casa del merchato e ridurla a fitti de cera, e cosi tutte quelle altre nostre rasone de la piazza per il bixogno de la corte..."(S. Davari, "I Palazzi del Antico Comune di Mantova e gli Incendi da Essi Subiti", Atti e Memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, 1888, p.47).

542. Braghirolli, 1869, Doc.XVIII, p.27-8. See also, Braghirolli, 1876, p.618, note 31.

543. Fancelli had made a fireplace for the castle on 11th December 1457 (Doc.170). See also, Documents 173 and 174. The stonework of the Camera degli Sposi was attributed to Fancelli by Ozzola (Il Museo Medievale di Mantova: Palazzo Ducale, Mantova, n.d., p.118). Paccagnini (1961, p.69) attributed only the execution to Fancelli, the designer being Mantegna. Marani (1961, p.87) is of the same opinion.

544. C. Cottafavi, "Ricerche e Documenti sulle Costruzioni del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova...", Atti e Memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, N.S., Vol.XXV, Parte 3, 1939, "Le Loggie del Castello di Mantova", pp.197-202. G. Pacchioni ("L'Opera di Luciano Laurana a Mantova",

Bollettino d'Arte, 1923-4, p.99ff.) suggested that Luciano produced the design. However, Luciano was in Mantua five years earlier. Nevertheless, the arrangement at the junction of the two arcades -a pier and two columns- may signify a knowledge of the thinking of Luciano that produced the solution found in the courtyard of the Palazzo Ducale at Urbino. See also, G. & A. Pacchioni, Mantova, 1930, pp.75-6.

545. See above, Chapter IV, note 200.

546. See above, note 356.

547. Gian Antonio da Rezo was at work at Gonzaga in September 1458 (Docs.205, 206). Lodovico had been involved in discussions regarding the work on 4th August (Doc.201). The Factor General, Rolandino della Volta, reported the progress of work providing interior furnishings on 8th September 1458 (Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.LXXIV, p.190; d'Arco, 1857, Doc.7, p.9). On 14th September 1458, Barbara of Brandenburg wrote from Mantua to Lodovico about the work: "A Gonzaga secondo mi disse el factore, el factore e Zohanne Antonio Marangone se lavorano continuamente e sperano che al ritorno de essa Vostra Signoria la camera sera fornita." (A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2886, Cop.Lib.34, f.74r.). Round about this time -though not precisely at this time, for he was engaged at Carpi and had promised to work at Revere (Docs. 187, 196)- Lorenzo tagliapietra, or 'scarpellino', may have provided stonework for Gonzaga. He wrote asking for

payment on 8th November 1462 (Gaye, op.cit., Doc.LXXX, p.197).

However, there seems to have been a more energetic campaign later. Schivenoglia wrote that in 1467, "...el sior. mes. lo marchexo Lodovigo faxia molto fabricare a Gonzaga et a chi volia andar a chapezare a Gonzaga se fixia donato el tereno"(op.cit., p.160), and, "De lano 1468 se chomenzoe el palazzo de Gonzaga zoe in lo chastello de Gonzaga. Hora non voio dire le brighe chea via li homeni del paese et quanto dovetero lavorare, perche el ducha de Milano volia vegnire a vederlo e darse piaxire in quello paixe; tutij i muradorij, marengonij et depintorij de Mantoa e de Mantoana chonvene andare a lavorare a Gonzaga"(op.cit., p. 164-5. See also, Amadei, Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.156.). Work was also done at Gonzaga prior to a visit of Galeazzo Maria Sforza and Bona di Savoie in August 1471. Fancelli worked there (Braghirolli, 1876, p.617, note 27, extract of a letter from Fancelli to Lodovico, 28th June 1471, and Doc.III, pp.625-26, a letter from Fancelli to Lodovico, 7th July 1471). According to Brown's checklist, Luca wrote 24 letters from Gonzaga between 21st March and 20th July 1471 (C. Brown, 1972, pp.153-66). It has been suggested that the building with the scaffolding behind the Meeting at the left in the Camera degli Sposi is Gonzaga and that the other building is Goito (See, A. Martindale & N. Garavaglia, The Complete Paintings of Mantegna, London, 1971, no.51a, p.107.).

548. Work at Cavriana was the subject of discussion involving Lodovico and Giovanni da Padova and perhaps also Gian Antonio da Rezo on 4th August 1458 (Doc.201). Schivenoglia wrote that work was done on the 'rocca' at Cavriana in 1460: "...el signor mes. Lodovigo fe fare over rifare la rocha de chavriana over la fece chomenzare con molte personij tutij vilanij de Mantoa"(op.cit., p.146). An important part of the work seems to have concerned the moat. Lodovico wrote to Barbara from the baths at Petriolo on 12th May 1460, asking to have reports from his engineers on the progress of works, and especially the moat at Cavriana (A. Fortioli, I Gonzaga ai Bagni di Petriolo di Siena nel 1460 e 1461, Mantova, 1876). A letter of 19th March 1463 shows that Samuele da Tradate was decorating the palace according to designs by Mantegna (Luzio, 1913, p.22). The work continued into the next year (Kristeller, 1901, Docs. 11 and 12, pp.470-71, 7th and 12th March 1464). Fancelli worked at Cavriana in 1468 (Braghirolli, 1876, p.617, note 23. Luca wrote to Lodovico about works on 7th August.). From Brown's checklist (1972), it may be seen that Fancelli was at Cavriana in August 1466 and from August to October 1468.

549. From a letter of 30th June 1473, from Anselmo Leombeni, in Mantua, to Lodovico, there is notice that Fancelli had gone off to Saviola (Braghirolli, 1878, Doc.V, p.16). Lodovico wrote to Fancelli about the palace on 6th August 1470 (Braghirolli, 1876, p.617, note 24). Fancelli wrote

to Lodovico from Saviola on 9th August 1475 (C. Brown, 1972, p.156). As has been seen, Luca's assistant, Francesco, was working there in the same year. See above, note 442.

550. Schivenoglia wrote, of 1460, "...et chosij de questo tempo (Lodovico) faxia lavorare et fortifichare Goito per far metere in ordene de far el ponte de preda a Goito che passa menzo"(op.cit., p.146). Bertolotti (1893, p.86) referred to Lodovico's work of 1461 to enlarge the fortifications. See also, G. Intra, "Il Castello di Goito", Archivio Storico Lombardo. Ser.II, Anno XV, 1888, pp.23-48.

551. Marani, 1961, p.109.

552. C. Brown, 1972, pp.154-55.

553. Marani (1961, p.61, note 25) thinks that the villa may have been the property sold to Barbara of Brandenburg by the Cavriani in 1471.

Chapter VII.

554. See above, Chapter V, note 226.

555. A.S.M.A.G., Fusta 2395, n.404.

556. A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Filelfo e l'umanesimo alle corti dei Gonzaga, Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XVI, Torino, 1890, p.170.

557. See, G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, p.391.

558. See above, Chapter I, note 32.

559. Pius II, Commentarii, Gragg & Gabel, p.184. For Latin, see above, Chapter III, note 81. Pius' reference to this architect of genius suggests that he knew who he was. Would not the architect have been famous and perhaps known to Pius personally? Despite the important role played by Lodovico in the design process, and the fact that Lodovico's letter to Alberti asking the latter to send a copy of Vitruvius to Pius suggests that Lodovico and Pius discussed architecture, it is unlikely that Pius thought of Lodovico as the architect. Filarete certainly did not. Pius' reference, taken in conjunction with Filarete's remarks about the adoption of the ancient style by builders of private houses and about the palace, suggests the possibility that both writers thought of Alberti. Filarete

observed that the ancient style was recovered by Brunelleschi. Come the second generation phase of the antique revival, private patrons used the style. Perhaps a parallel is implied between his two examples of private buildings in the ancient style, the Palazzo Rucellai and the palace at Revere. Perhaps they shared a single author. Only Alberti and Bernardo Rossellino, representatives of the second generation, were architects for whom Pius would definitely have held up a torch. Both were apparently involved with the Palazzo Rucellai. There is no known record of Alberti in contact with Lodovico in the early 1450s. Somewhere in the Mantuan territory, Pius may have seen a work that he wished, himself, to copy. On 14th May 1460, Zaccaria da Pisa wrote to Barbara of Brandenburg from the baths at Petriolo: "...non hanno presentato a SS. el disegno de la camera e saletta che voleria fare SS. qui a bagni e rimaso perche non basta el tempo e anchora male si trovano qui le cose necessarie a tal bisogni"(A. Portioli, I Gonzaga ai Bagni di Petriolo nel 1460 e 1461, Mantova, 1876, p.15).

560. Pius II, Commentarii..., 1584, Bk.IX: "...et passu placido nil pedibus elevatis cuncta deambulare possunt."(Gragg & Gabel, pp.597-601).

561. Filarete wrote of the Palazzo Medici in Florence, "...salito che se la scale si truova uno andito largho quanto e il portico di sotto sul quale e l'entrata della sala"(Filarete/

Spencer, f.190r.). What was noteworthy in Florence was presumably also noteworthy at Revere. However, it should be noted that Cardinal Roteno criticised the staircase at Revere, when he visited on 28th January 1460 (Doc.223).

562. Pius, in his description of his palace at Pienza, though he was not specific, implied a sensibility to the orientation of the apartments with regard to sun and shade (Gragg & Gabel, pp.597-601).

563. See above, Chapter II, note 80.

564. C. Eubel, Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi, Vol.II, Regensburg, 1914. In Isidore's company was "Santo Sixto". He was Juan de Torquemada.

565. Pius II, Commentaries, pp.297-98 (Gragg & Gabel).

566. See, for example, R. Hatfield, Art Pulletin, 1970, for discussion of this kind of praise.

567. Alberti, De Re', V, 1, "Larem quidem familiarem habebit quisque similem huic, cui sese pro vitae instituto esse velit similem, aut regi aut tyranno aut demum privato." (Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.I, p.357).

568. See, in this connection, Gombrich's discussion of amplificatio in "The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", p.296ff. Noting

that Alberto Avogadro's description of the Badia of Fiesole is much exaggerated, he indicates that, yet, it could not be called an out and out lie, for it followed the rules of 'rhetorical exaggeration'.

569. Earlier opinions of the 'virtue' of magnificence had been mixed. For changing attitudes to wealth in the 14th and 15th centuries, see, H. Baron, "Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought", Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies, Vol.XIII, n.1, 1938, pp.1-37. Baron contrasted the unequivocal Stoical-Franciscan view that wealth was abhorrent with the Aristotelian-Thomist view deriving from the soul/body distinction; that wealth served the needs of the body.

570. A. Frazer Jenkins ("Cosimo de' Medici's Patronage of Architecture and the Theory of Magnificence", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.33, 1970, p.166) refers, in this connection, to Filelfo's *Convivia Mediolanensia* (1537, p.78ff.).

In an oration delivered on 20th August 1460, on the occasion of the nomination of Giacomo Borromei as Bishop of Pavia, Filelfo said that patronage "...quod in bonos et claros homines beneficium confert, id non tam dare, quam accipere existimat." (Quoted by G. Biscaro, "Documenti milanesi inediti su Francesco Filelfo", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XL, Fasc. XXXVII, Milano, 1913, p.215).

571. Frazer Jenkins, op.cit.

572. Alberti, De Re', V, 14: "The meaner sort build only for necessity; but the rich for pleasure and delight".(Leone/Rykwert): "...nanque tenuiores quidem cohabitandi modum ex necessitate metiuntur, lautiores vix ex sacietate finiunt libidine terminos".(Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.I, p.401). For the biographer of Brunelleschi, Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, wealth was also a condition of beauty in architecture. In fact, Manetti's scenario for the development of architecture derives substantially from Alberti's. For Manetti, too, the first buildings moderated the extremes of hot and cold and dry and moist: "Questa arte del murare... ebbe principio da ... cose ... necessarie solamente per fuggire e freddi e caldi, e venti e le piogge"(The Life of Brunelleschi by Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, Trans. C. Enggass, Introd. etc. H. Saalman, Penn. State University Press, 1970, p.57). When building developed thanks to the craft of the mason in dressing stones, commodity and delight followed in the service of magnificence: "Lequalj pietre cosi concie furono qualche principio di ponpa, venendo su le richeze e principati alle ponpose per gloria e per dimostrare la magnificenza e per dare amirationi e fare agi e comodj e di quindj affare le cose da rinchiudere e tresorj e regnj."(loc.cit.).

573. He wrote, for example, in De Re' (V, 18), "Tenuiorum aedificationes, quantum ferunt facultates, ex locupletiorum

lautitie sibi exempla vendicabunt, quae imitentur hac
adhibita moderatione, ut emolumenti rationes posthabuisse
nunquam velint voluptati"(Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.I, p.435).

574. J. Onians ("Alberti and Filarete", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.34, 1971, p.101) wrote, "This assimilation of architectural forms (in De Re') to human actions (in Cicero's De Officiis) is possible for Alberti only because he is determined to show that buildings, like men, can be subject to the rules of morality."
575. That, on first consideration, would appear to be the danger facing Francesco Sforza when Niccolo de' Carissimi da Parma wrote to him on 17th April 1459, about the Palazzo Medici. But Niccolo insisted that imitation was the duty of virtue: "If Your Lordship were to see it, I take it for certain that it would cost you a good sum of money, because with the magnanimity and greatness of mind that you have, you too would want to do something worthy -and not only equal but surpass it if that were possible."(R. Hatfield, 1970, p.233). In suggesting that magnanimity was the cause of emulative desire, Niccolo perhaps recalled opinions like that of Palmieri who remarked, in La Vita Civile, "He who would want ... to build a house resembling the magnificent ones of noble citizens would deserve blame if first he had not reached or excelled him in virtue".(Quoted by R. Goldthwaite, "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture", The American Historical Review, Vol.77, n.4, 1972, p.890.).

576. Alberti, De Re', V, 1: "Dignissimi sunt, quibus rerum summa et moderatio committatur"(Bonelli/Portoghesi, Vol.I, p.333).
577. See above, Chapter V, note 310.
578. Where magnificence is the aspect of the form but has not been the cause of its creation, mere imitation of form has resulted. It can have no true content and is bogus expression. When a discrepancy was discovered between the virtue of the patron and the virtue of the object, a certain confusion arose in the mind of the critic. Pius II did not economise on space in his Commentaries as he listed the crimes of Sigismondo Malatesta, but he could still write, "Nevertheless he built at Rimini a splendid church dedicated to St. Francis ... In it he erected ... a tomb of magnificent marble and exquisite workmanship..."(Gragg & Gabel, Bk.II, p.167). Here is a case of an art object taking over an intrinsic value rather than an extrinsic one -the value it would have had, for example, as an expression of religious devotion (impossible in the light of the atheism or paganism of Sigismondo.). The point of importance here is Pius' evident discomfiture at being obliged to write something that reflected distinction upon his enemy. Alternatively, the passage could be read as an ostentatious display of fair-mindedness.
- Later, writing of Borso d'Este, however, he did not allow fine appearances to colour his judgement, even slightly, as

in the case of Sigismondo. (Both Sigismondo and Borso incurred the enmity of Pius. Borso, though owing allegiance to the Pope, supported Sigismondo and the French, whose ambitions frustrated the immediate prosecution of the crusade.). Of Borso, Pius wrote, "...he desired to seem rather than to be magnificent and generous"(Gragg & Gabel, Bk.II, p.181). Indeed, Borso does seem to have dressed rather richly. G. Campori ("Una visita del Marchese di Mantova al Duca Borso in Sassuolo", Atti e Memorie delle R.R. Deputazioni di Storia Patria per le provincie dell' Emilia, N.S., Vol.VI, Pt.1, 1881, p.120) remarked that Borso was dressed in customary fashion when he came down from his apartments on 25th July 1458. He was dressed, according to a letter of that day, "...di drappo d'oro foderato di ermellini con una collanetta di perle e rubini." Pius considered that liberality and magnificence in Borso were outward aspects that belied his true character. Since the outward aspect of a person is, to an extent, an artifice, it is, in respect of appearance, no different from a building -similarly the expression of its owner. Pius noticed a discrepancy between building and social status and made the probable criticism in terms that Alberti might have used -that the Palazzo Medici of Cosimo was fit for a king. ("...aedificavit in urbe palatium rege dignum..." 1584, p.88; Gragg & Gabel, p.162).

Garin noted a difference of attitude between Pico and Poliziano (La Cultura Filosofica del Rinascimento Italiano, Firenze, 1961, p.339). The one believed that art makes

for freedom, the other the converse. In different contexts, other values than freedom could be used. So, the question here would be whether art makes for magnificence or vice versa. While hopeful beneficiaries of patronage might argue the former, Pius argued the latter point. Perhaps he addresses the question whether magnificence is a cause or effect. Certainly, he denied that magnificence is an accident with regard to substance.

579. See above, Chapter I, note 2.

Fride was taken in the wealth of the community. Schivenoglia wrote of the visit to Mantua of Christian of Denmark in March 1474, "Adj 23 de marzo foe fato le piu belij boteghij per Mantoa che mai foxeno fate et foe mexe fora denanze dei garzarij panij intregghij de lana cercha 5000 ma questo foe fato per mostrare la richeza de la tera a questij todeschij" (op.cit., p.178).

580. Vol.IV, Lombardia (Zecche Minori), Bologna, 1970.

581. For the history of the relic, see for example, Mazzoldi, 1961, pp.16-18. Amadei (Cronaca Universale..., Vol.II, p.108) wrote that, during the congress, the Dominican, Cardinal Torrecremata, decided negatively on the matter of its authenticity, whereas Francesco da Savona della Rovere authenticated it.

582. The St. George's cross was a flag of the city of Mantua,

as well as the name of the castle. See, G. Gerola, "Vecchie insegne di casa Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.V, Anno XLV, Fasc. 1, 1918, p.107.

583. Lodovico was also probably conscious of the financial advantages that would derive from entertaining the Curia and the council representatives. Pius, in his Commentaries (Gragg & Gabel, p.117), observed that Virgil had sung the praises of Aeneas of Troy and that Aeneas of Siena enriched Virgil's native city (of Mantua). He also referred to the displeasure of the Romans when they learned of Pius' intention to convoke the council away from Rome, because they would loose the emoluments of the Curia (op.cit., p.119).

584. W. Braghirolli, "Vergilio e i Gonzaga", Album Virgiliana, 1883, Doc.II, p.181 (and p.177 for part of the reply); A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Platina e i Gonzaga", Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XIII, Torino, 1889, p.432.

Platina wrote on the subject on 1st January 1460, saying that in Tuscany and particularly in Florence, were sculptors who approached the ancients: "...ni profecto tibi ad vivam reddent imaginem illam et spiranta mollius aera." In view of the fact that Lodovico said that he had taken the necessary steps, Alberti's letter of 27th February (1460) in which he wrote, "...e modonj de Santo Sebastiano, Sancto Laurentio, la logia et Vergilio sono facti, credo non vi dispiaceranno", (G. Mancini, Leonis Baptistae Alberti

-Opera Inedita et Pauca Separatim Impressa, Firenze, 1890, pp.288-9. Braghirolli (1869, pp.7-8) omitted the words "et Vergilio".) would seem to refer to a statue of Virgil rather than the Palazzo del Podestà, or del Virgilio, on which Luca Fancelli was at work on 12th August 1462 (Doc. 231) and Gian Antonio da Rezo was at work on 11th August 1462 (Braghirolli, 1876).

585. However, personal imprese could be both public and obscure. For example, on the front door at Revere is carved a rocky mountain surrounded by water and accompanied by the word AMOMOC. G. Gerola ("Un'impresa ed un motto di casa Gonzaga", Rivista d'Arte, 1930, pp.381-402) explained the motto as referring to the island of Trinacria and an episode in the Odyssey. Ulysses landed there with his companions, who slaughtered the white bulls dedicated to Jove. The latter threw down thunderbolts and sank the fleet. Ulysses was saved. The word 'amomoc' means immaculate. Gerola took the device to refer to Mantua. However, he did not mention another point of possible interest: Trinacria, the island of the sun, belonged to Helios, an archer and herdsman, who became confused with Apollo (H. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Mythology, London, 1965, p.33). It was Helios who called down Jove's wrath on Ulysses' companions. Lodovico's motto "par un sol désir" implies the patronage of Apollo. The word 'amomoc' is also the first word of the longest psalm in Greek, and that is the name given to it (119, Authorised Version). It concentrates upon piety and

obedience, to God's certain Law and Judgement.

586. Faith and Wisdom aided Lodovico in 1453 in his campaign against the Venetians, celebrated by G.P. Arrivabene (Gonzagidos, p.6). Lodovico, "excelsa ... fede refulgens", received Jove's instructions via Minerva more than once. He had a vision of her (pp.53-4), "Ecce autem, ante oculos divini principis alma/ Pallas adest, nimbo effulgens atque aegide, saevis/ crinibus anguiferae pectus valata Medusae."
587. See, W. Harrison Woodward, Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators, Cambridge, 1897. Contemporaries noted that Vittorino was not himself a writer. Thus, he was not vainglorious, and was first of all a teacher (E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.I, 1959, pp.22-3).
588. Pius II, Commentaries, Bk.II, p.186, Gragg & Gabel. "Ex his ortus est Lodovicus, qui per tempora Pij Papae huic urbi praefuit, armorum et litterarum peritia clarus: nam et parentis gloriam militatis adaequavit; et Victorinum oratorem audiens, praeceptoris propemodum doctrinam assecutus est, mitis ingenij, et iustitiae observantissimus." (1584 edition, p.105).
589. Harrison Woodward, 1897, p.136: "Now both mind and body, the two elements of which we are constituted, must be developed side by side". Alberti's architecture, as has been seen, sought the same equivalence. Pius was an active Pope.

He fulfilled Cardinal Bessarion's requirement: "La Chiesa ha bisogno di un capo attivo, capace di correr dovunque per fronteggiare il pericolo Turco"(Quoted by E. Garin, La Cultura Filosofica..., 1961, p.41).

590. "History," wrote P.P. Vergerio, "...gives us the concrete examples of the precepts inculcated by philosophy."(Harrison Woodward, 1897, p.106, translation from De Ingenuis Moribus). Pius wrote to Ladislas, "...a prince who cannot read the lessons of history is a helpless prey to flattery and intrigue."(op.cit., p.141).

591. See, E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.II, 1962, p.15. The biography by Prendilacqua is quoted, and Vittorino says. "...noi dobbiamo aspettarci molti difficili casi i ciascuno dei quali, se v'incorrano, porterete con animo più tranquillo; trovandovi in più cauta fortuna, godrete ad ogni modo di tal beneficio; essendo in voi buone le cose, che nessun bisogno vi chiede. La qual sentenza non è mia ma degli Stoici."

592. Harrison Woodward, 1897, p.140.

593. Alberti, Opere Volgari, a cura di A. Bonucci, Firenze, 1844, Vol.I, pp.88-109.

594. The stoical tenor of Alberti's thought is well demonstrated perhaps by his question, "...chi mai stimerá potere

assequire pregio alcuno o dignità, senza ardentissimo studio di perfectissime arti, senza molto sudare in cose virilissime e faticosissime?"(Quoted by E. Garin, L'Umanesimo Italiano, Bari, 1952, p.86).

595. Giovanni Andrea de' Bussi remarked that Vittorino "fu venerabile per coerenza di vita."(See above, Chapter I, note 23). It may be inferred that the virtues proclaimed by the imagery of Lodovico's medal were consistent with one another.
596. The room was decorated between c.1465 and 1474. See, R. Signorini, "Lettura Storica degli Affreschi della 'Camera degli Sposi' di A. Mantegna", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.38, 1975, pp.109-35; C. Brown, "New Documents for Andrea Mantegna's 'Camera degli Sposi'", Burlington Magazine, Vol.CXIV, 1972, pp.861-63.
597. A. Patricolo (Guida del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Mantova, 1908, p.69) viewed the Letter in this way. N. Gianantoni was of the same opinion (Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Roma, 1929, p.116).
598. G. Pacchioni ("La Camera Picta" di Andrea Mantegna nel Castello di Mantova, Milano, 1960) rejected any suggestion that the wall paintings are group portraits in the sense of 'conversation pieces' because "...sarebbe un modo del tutto inconsueto allo spirito del tempo."

599. P. Kristeller (Mantegna, London, 1901, p.246) noted that the Meeting contains three generations of Gonzagas -three of prelates and three of marquises.

Other attempts have been made to identify the depictions as specific events. Signorini (1975, pp.105-35) lists the various interpretations and, for his part, argues that the Meeting occurred on 1st January 1462, when Lodovico encountered his son, Cardinal Francesco at Bozzolo.

Lodovico was hurrying to Milan, having learned by letter (depicted on the adjacent wall) that Francesco Sforza was gravely ill. However, the decoration of the room and the pictures seem to have an emblematic character rather than be records of transient events.

600. A. Possevino (op.cit., p.560) gave a speech to Gian Francesco when, after losing his condotta with Venice in 1436, he made his peace with Lodovico: "Tibi coniunx cum spe dominationis, Caesari consanguinitate iuncta, et masculis virtutibus, supra muliebrem fragilitatem commendata, obligit."

601. Leonardo Bruni held a jaundiced view of Imperial Rome, and it cannot have been easy to give the lie to such comments as he made about the emperors: "After the liberty of the Roman people had been lost through the rule of the emperors, who did not desist from killing and eliminating men of excellence, the flourishing condition of studies and letters perished, together with the welfare of the city of Rome. Augustus, who was the least evil of the emperors, had

thousands of Roman citizens slain; Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero did not leave anyone alive who had the face of a man. There followed then, Galba, Otho and Vitellius, who killed off each other within a few months."

(The Portable Renaissance Reader, Ed. J. Ross & M. McLaughlin, New York, 1967, p.127).

602. For example, the area between the Piazza Sordello and the Piazza Mantegna was almost completely remodelled during Lodovico's marquisate. It is enough to refer to work done and projected on the Broletto, the Palazzo del Mercato, the Torre del Orologio, San Lorenzo and S. Andrea. E. Johnson (S. Andrea in Mantua, Ph.D., New York University, 1970, pp.149-53) wrote of a programme of urban renewal in the area to the east of S. Andrea. He wrote (p.153) that this part of Mantua "...must ... be added to the list of early Renaissance attempts to revive the cityscape of antiquity." However, K. Forster ("Praxis Stadtischer Planung und Erneuerung in Mantua", summary of lecture, in Kunstchronik, Oct. 1972, Heft 10, pp.339-40) advises against conceiving of town planning proposals in Mantua as purely formal undertakings. Rather, architectural, political and economic purposes all contributed in the 'zoned' city

603. Whether or not Lodovico intended it, S. Bettinelli (Delle lettere e delle arti mantovane, Milano, 1774, p.23) was motivated to write, "Permettetemi, o mantovani, ch'io chiami

quel Principe il nostro Augusto." As Augustus, he may, of course, have felt the need of a Virgil to patronize. But there seems to have been no shortage of literati who would have been happy to assume the role. Platina wrote a history of Mantua, and Arrivabene, the author of Gonzagidos, may have seen himself offering a Virgilian service to Lodovico.

604. Mazzoldi, 1961, Chapters 4 & 5.

605. A. Luzio & R. Renier, 1889, pp.434-5.

606. Lodovico, on 15th May 1469, insisted upon correcting the history of Mantua before publication (ibid., pp.436-38).

607. Platina, 1685, p.427.

608. A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Filelfo e l'umanesimo alle corti dei Gonzaga", Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XVI, Torino, 1890, pp.118-217.

609. "In questi di passati io scrissi alla V. S. de una certa quantitate de polexi de mia preda date per el palassio de Gonzaga, che montano L.23, over circa, di quali non ho avuto niente...", 8th November 1462 (C. d'Arco, 1857, Vol. II, Doc.9, p.10)(Caye, op.cit., Doc.LXXX, p.197, omitted the words "de Gonzaga" from his transcription.).

610. See above, Chapter VI, note 454.

611. P. Kristeller, op.cit., Doc.30, p.478. On 13th May 1478, Mantegna referred to the "...opinione di molti in Italia a liquale pare che nodi nel late soto lombra di vostra Celsitudine..." See also, D. Chambers, Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance, London, 1970, Doc.60, pp.118-20. Lodovico wrote back to him from Goito on 15th May (Kristeller, op.cit., Doc.31), explaining his own poverty and proclaiming that all his jewels were in pawn.

612. L. Pratilli, "Felice Feliciano alla luce dei suoi codici", Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Anno 1939-40, Vol.XCIX, Pt.II, p.74.

613. 12th May 1460. "Visto quanto ne scrivi per lo beneficio de San Salvatore respondemo che, essendo qui (Petriolo), non voressemo attender a simil facenda ma quello ve habiamo promesso de non abandonarvi ve le attenderemo advisandove che de San Sebastiano come se compito siamo fin da mo contenti farvene provisione ma voremo prima far cum vui altri capituli."(Braghirolli, 1869, p.9)(A.S.M.A.G., Busta 2885, Cop.Lib.31, f.59v.).

614. C. Clough ("Federigo da Montefeltro's Patronage of the Arts, 1468-82", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.36, 1973, pp.129-44) believes that Federigo seldom made the customary gifts in thanks for unsolicited eulogies

and dedications -that he got his praises free.

615. Luzio & Renier, 1890. On 9th September 1458, he instructed Vincenzo Scalona, in Milan, to provide 50 ducats for Filelfo's journey to Rome (p.170). In answer to another request for money he wrote a very apologetic letter, telling Filelfo to "...non imputare questo ad altro che a la impossibilitade."(loc.cit., 21st December 1457). Filelfo was rather qualifiedly appreciative of Lodovico's generosity when he wrote to Zaccaria da Pisa on 8th July 1478 (p.164), "Lo Illu. Signore Marchese Zohan Francesco fu dignissimo et liberalissimo quanto alchuno altro havesse l'Italia. Sequito di po' lui lo Ill. S.^{re} Marchese Lodovico il quale fu molto meno liberale dil Signor suo padre. Ma pur dava sed non libenter..."
- Perhaps Filelfo was especially favoured by Gian Francesco. But the latter was more like his son when he replied to a request for money from Pisanello, with the excuse that he was short of funds (U. Rossi, "Pisanello e i Gonzaga", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, Fasc.III, 1888, p.454, letter of 11th September 1443.). He wrote frankly to Paola Malatesta from Goito on 25th August 1418, "Paola, per dio tenete ogni bon modo che ne sia possibele de retrovar quelli dinari, perche, como piu ce aguarda seria, tanto piu ne par che ci siamo de bixogno, e quando i ne mancarazeno, i seria el piu impaciado omo nel mondo."
- F. Tarducci, "Gian Francesco Gonzaga, Signore di Mantova (1407-1420)", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XXIX, 1902, pp.60-61).

616. The prince might have been a creditor unable to redeem his debt. For example, on 27th September 1445, a treaty was drawn up between Milan and Mantua and Lodovico was to receive 1.000 ducats per month in times of peace and war. However, the money was not forthcoming, and Leonello d'Este came to Lodovico's aid with cash and pressure in Filippo Maria Visconti to conclude a fresh agreement (Mazzoldi, 1961, pp.4-5). It was Francesco Sforza who was the villain of the piece and who was debtor to Lodovico for 42.000 ducats, on 15th March 1465, when Giacomo da Palazzo was sent to redeem the debt (See, L. Beltrami, "L'Annullamento del contratto di matrimonio fra Galeazzo M. Sforza e Dorotea Gonzaga (1463)", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno 16, Fasc. I, 1889, pp.126-32; S. Davari, "Il Matrimonio di Dorotea Gonzaga con Galeazzo Maria Sforza", Giornale Ligustico di Archeologia, Storia e Letteratura, Anno 16, Genova, 1889, pp.363-80 & pp.401-13). Then, the bad faith of relations could cause the depletion of funds. Lodovico secured the release of his brother, Carlo, from imprisonment by standing guarantor for his good behaviour to his gaoler, Francesco Sforza. When Carlo went off into the service of Venice, Lodovico found himself owing Francesco the sum of 80.000 ducats, to be paid at 10.000 ducats per year (Mazzoldi, 1961, p.12).

617. As Kristeller remarked, had Mantegna not felt himself at least adequately rewarded for his services, it is unlikely that he would have stayed at Mantua for 19 years (op.cit., p.195).

618. Filarete/Spencer. The dedication (p.3) contains a recommendation of patronage as a means of providing employment. In the dedication to Francesco Sforza, he also regarded it as an investment (p.4, note 5).

Gianozzo, in Alberti's Della Famiglia, Bk.III, recommends labour-intensive industries, "...perche ivi in più persone il danaro si sparge, e così a molti poveri utilità ne vene." (Opere Volgari, Vol.I, a cura di C. Grayson, Bari, 1960, p.204). See also, Vespasiano da Bisticci's Life of Cosimo de' Medici, 1951, p.416.

619. As Gombrich remarked ("The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", pp.284-5), in Lorenzo de' Medici's record of expenditure, no distinction was made between architectural patronage and charitable donations.

620. A. Brown ("The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de' Medici, 'Pater Patriae'", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.24, 1961, p.213) wrote of the self-interest of poets who "...in glorifying the return of the Golden Age of peace and plenty in which the Muses would flourish under the patronage of the Medici ... were attempting to stimulate the Medici to play an imperial role in Florence..." Such a purpose could complement the artists'. Filarete, in Book XXV of the treatise, considered the virtue of liberality. For him, patronage seems to have been, in fact, the handing down to posterity of a record of liberality. In such a case, patronage and magnificence are almost synonymous.

621. S. Davari, "I Palazzi del Antico Comune di Mantova...",

1888, pp.45-6.

622. See, Coniglio, 1958, Chapter on 'Vita Economica', pp.461-78.

Regarding Lodovico's efforts to populate the territory, see for example, M. Equicola, Dell'Istoria di Mantova, Mantova, 1610, p.187.

623. On 31st January, he wrote to Francesco Gonzaga, "...aviso

Eccellentia Vostra come io con ogni diligentia et sudore vado dietro servendo la Santita del Nostro Signore credendo etiam servire la Eccellentia Vostra ... io sono pur stato, si puo dire, alievo de Illustrissima casa de Gonzaga et olui sempre inzegnato di farli onore e son qui per questo..."

(E. Battisti, "Il Mantegna e La Letteratura Classica", Arte, Pensiero e Cultura ... a Mantova..., Firenze, 1965, pp.36-7. This and another letter to Francesco, of 15th June 1489, are also referred to by V. Golzio & G. Zander, in Storia di Roma, Vol.XXVIII, Bologna, 1968, pp.292-300.).

624. He described his appointment as capomaestro as "...il piu

stimato ufficio d'Italia per architettura, et anche a Vostra Signoria e onore che un vostro architetto sia eletto sopra questa fabrica, che si tira dietro le altre, et qui dond'e tanti valenti homeni in questa faculta."(Braghirolli, 1876, Doc.XVIII).

625. Relatively little building work was done in Mantua during

Gian Francesco's time. In 1420, he issued a decree encouraging masters of building to come to Mantua (1961, p.12, note 35). There was probably a shortage of skilled man-power -especially for stone-carving- in Mantua when Lodovico rose to the marquisate. Perhaps Mantua was typical in mid century in needing to import craftsmen and Florence had superfluous labour. A huge project like the Duomo made a demand for craftsmen that, perhaps, dynasties of masons and carvers filled.

626. W. Braghirolli, "Donatello a Mantova", Giornale di Erudizione Artistica, Vol.III, 1873, pp.4-10.
627. L. Beltrami, Vita di Aristotele da Bologna, Milano, 1912, p.42. Letter of 1st February 1459, from Lodovico to his representative in Milan, Vincenzo Scalona, for example.
628. M. dall'Acqua ("Storia di un progetto albertiano non realizzato: la ricostruzione della Rotonda di San Lorenzo in Mantova", in Il Sant' Andrea di Mantova e Leon Battista Alberti, 1974, pp.229-36) suggests that Lodovico was mortified by criticisms of the city after the council -the want of paving in the streets and squares.
629. See above, Chapter III, note 105.
630. In Platina's advice that Lodovico erect a statue of Virgil, it is not clear whether literature or the visual arts would

be nurtured. The very ambiguity may suggest that the act would be intrinsically valuable. "Erit, mihi crede," he wrote, "hac quoque in re non solum apud Italos, verum apud exteras gentes tuum nomen illustrius." See, W. Braghirolli, "Virgilio e i Gonzaga", Album Virgiliana, 1883, Doc.II, p.181; 1st January 1460; Luzio & Renier, 1889, p.432; E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vol.I, p.55.

631. E. Garin (1952, p.84) wrote, with regard to Alberti's De Iciarchia, "Virtù significa què, s'è detto, umanità, opera umana saggia e prudente, virtuosa e forte, meditata con calcolo sottile, inserita e finezza nel guoco delle forze mondane."
632. Filarete/Spencer, f.59r. & v. It is the gist of his remarks about the revival of Ciceronian and Virgilian usage. Revival is a kind of faith-keeping.
633. See above, Chapter I, note 32.
634. See above, note 575.
645. This is not to say that there would be no difference between public and private, and between secular and ecclesiastical buildings, as Wittkower seemed to think (Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism, London, 1951, p.1). Details may be shared, but they do not constitute the whole building.

636. If virtù may be defined as wisdom in pursuit of possible goods (Alberti wrote in the prologue to Della Famiglia, "...solo è senza virtù chi nolla vuole." (Quoted by C. Grayson, "The Humanism of Alberti", Italian Studies, Vol. XII, 1957, p.44)), Alberti also believed in the possibility of man being free while following the demand that objective beauty makes to be cultivated when he wrote, in Della Famiglia, "...nè gli pareva giustamente da chiamare libero alcuno in chi si desiderassi virtù alcuna." (Opere Volgari, a cura di C. Grayson, Vol. I, Bari, 1960, p.55). Of course, virtù is also liberating insofar as a man willing to virtue is in harmony with nature, whose end is supposed to be good.
637. For Filarete and the tower as symbol, see, S. von Moos, Die Kastelltyp-variationen des Filarete, Zurich, 1971.
638. J. Onians ("Filarete and the 'Qualità': architectural and social", in "Il Filarete", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 1973, pp.116-28) puts forward the opposite point of view.
639. And he observed acutely. His bronze doors for St. Peter's look like the display case of an archaeological museum. Evidently, he understood well the appearance of early Christian work, and he reproduced its aspect with remarkable faithfulness. But he was concerned with reconstructing visually by an additive process. Filarete's use of visual material for the creation of the ancient style in sculpture

is discussed by C. Seymour Jr., "Some Reflections on Filarete's Use of Antique Visual Sources", in "Il Filarete", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 1973, pp.36-47.

640. See above, Chapter I, note 34. The text of the letter is given below, note 676.

641. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.XCIII, 2nd February 1471, pp.227-8, and Doc.XCIV, 23rd March 1471, pp.228-34.

642. See, A. Brown, "The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de' Medici...", 1961, pp.186-221.

643. E. Gombrich ("The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", p.295) quotes "De Religione et Magnificentia Illustris Cosmi Medicei Florentinii", in G. Lami, Deliciae Eruditorum seu veterum anecdoton opusculorum Collectanae, Florentinae, MDCCXLII, Vol.XII, p.130: "Cosme, reor doctum pictorem te esse sequutum,/ Nomen qui aeternum post sua fata cupit."

644. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite de'uomini illustri del secolo XV, 1951, p.419: "Venendo all'architettura egli ne fu peritissimo, come si vede per più edifici fatti fare da lui; che non si murava o faceva nulla senza parere o giudizio suo; e alcuni che avevano a edificare, andavano, per parere a lui."

U. Procacci ("Cosimo de' Medici e la Costruzione della Badia Fiesolana", Commentari, Vol.19, 1968, pp.80-97) interprets

the recollection of Padre Isaiah -"Dicesi che egli stesso (Cosimo) fece il modello (of the Badia)..."- as proof that Cosimo (assisted by Timoteo Maffei and the capomaestro, Lorenzo d'Antonio de Geri) actually designed the building.

645. M. Lazzaroni & A. Munoz, Filarete, scultore e architetto del secolo XV, Roma, 1903, pp.186. Letter of 4th June 1456.

646. Vespasiano da Bisticci, op.cit., p.208: "Bene ch'egli avesse architettori appresso della sua Signoria, niente-dimeno nell'edificare intendeva il parere loro, dipoi dava e le misure e ogni cosa la sua Signoria, e pareva, a udirne ragionare, che la principale arte ch'egli avesse fatta mai fusse l'architettura; in modo ne sapeva ragionare e mettere in opera per lo suo consiglio!"

C. Clough ("Federigo da Montefeltro's Patronage of the Arts, 1468-82", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.36, 1973, p.141) believes that Federigo "...had neither the time nor the training to devise the building which he as a patron commissioned." There is no evidence that designing architects ceased to find employment when princes became interested in architecture. But it is not possible to account for all of Federigo's time. Nor did his education preclude the possibility of him acquiring a detailed knowledge of architectural theory and practice.

Lodovico and Federigo were in contact with one another in 1457, when Federigo visited the site of military engineering works at Ostiglia (29th April 1457, Doc.158). A. Luzio

(L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, Vol.II, Verona, 1922, p.178)

did not give specific references, but wrote, "La Reggia Mantovana fu rimaneggiata secondo i suggerimenti di Federico, riputato maestro d'architettura per le meraviglie accumulate ne'suoi palazzi di Urbino e Gubbio." Luzio may have been thinking of Matteo da Volterra's trip to Urbino in 1481, to acquire drawings of the palace. Federico Gonzaga was building the 'Domus Nova' at the time. See, C. Cottafavi, "La Domus Nova", Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, Vol.XXXIV, 1963, pp.8-18.

647. E. Driscoll, "Alfonso of Aragon as a patron of art", Essays in Honor of Karl Lehmann, Ed. L. Freeman Sandler, Marsyas Supplement, New York, 1964, pp.87-96.

648. C. Grayson, "Alberti, Poliziano e Bernardo Bembo", Arte, Pensiero e Cultura a Mantova..., pp.111-17.

649. E. Gombrich ("Early Medici as Patrons of Art", p.307) quotes "Philippi Redditi exhoratio ad Petrum Medicem in magnanimi sui parentis imitationem", in G. Lami, op.cit., p.198: "Iam quantus est in Architectura? In privatis publicisque aedificiis omnes eius utimur ingenio ac symmetriis. Nam hanc Architecturae disciplinam, summa Geometriae ratione exornavit perpolivitque; tantumque in ea profecit Laurentius, ut aetate nostra inter Geometras illustres non infimum teneat locum. Etenim digna Principe Geometria est qua nostri agitantur animi, nostraque acuuntur ingenia."

650. In January 1491, Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, "civis et architectus", also offered a design. Vasari, *Milanesi*, Vol.VI, p.304.
651. S. Bettinelli, 1774, p.40.
Platina's and Redditi's statements may imply an increase in the worth of the architect as a model of behaviour, compared with Avogadro's remark about Cosimo. Earlier, Bruni had written, "...the subtleties of arithmetic and geometry are not worthy to absorb a cultivated mind."
(Quoted by R. Rose, "Humanistic Culture and Renaissance Mathematics. The Italian Libraries of the Quattrocento", Studies in the Renaissance, Vol.XV, New York, 1973, p.52).
652. See above, Chapter III, note 96.
653. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.XCIV, p.229, 23rd March 1471.
654. Braghirolli, 1879, Doc.XI, pp.172-3.
656. C. Brown, "Luca Fancelli in Mantua...", 1972, pp.153-66.
657. ibid., p.155, letter of 15th December 1475.
658. Braghirolli, 1879, Doc.VI, of 8th April 1471, from Lodovico to Giovanni Aldobrandini: "...la intentione nostra non e stata de lavorare li per far la piu bella cosa di fiorenza..."

659. Braghirolli, 1879, Doc.XII, of 17th May 1471, from Lodovico to the Signori of Florence: "...el designo per me principiato non mi para una bella e digna cosa in se..."
660. See above, note 659.
661. ibid.
662. See above, note 653. See also, Braghirolli, 1879, Docs.IX and XI; Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.XCV.
663. For example, Giovanni da Padova, who inspected the work while en route to Naples, wrote on 8th May 1471, "O veduto el principio el quale vedo manifestamente tornera una bellissima cosa quanto al ordine e principio che si ritrova a essergli fato."(A. Bertolotti, Architetti, Ingegneri e Matematici..., 1889, p.15).
664. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.XCVI, p.235, 1st June 1471.
665. ibid., Doc. XCIV, p.232, 23rd March 1471.
666. Lorenzo de' Medici seems to have taken note of Lodovico's willfulness. He encouraged him to obey personal impulses when he said to Pietro del Tovaglia, "...seguitaria apunto secondo il gusto et appetito suo, al quale ognuno qui s' accorera volentieri e lauderollo come ragionevolmente si

debbe fare..."(G. Fratico, "Lorenzo il Magnifico e i Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Italiano, 1949, pp.155-71).

667. Frazer Jenkins, "Cosimo ... and Magnificence", 1970, p.167.

668. See, for example, Alberti, De Re', V, 14: "Urbanis aedificationibus evenit ut vicinus paries, stillicidum, publica area, via et eiusmodi pleraque omnia impediunt, quo minus ipse satisfacias."(Bonelli/Portoghesi, p.401). It is not clear whether this passage is directed specifically to the architect or the patron.

669. P.H. Michel (Un Ideal Humain: La Pensée de L.B. Alberti, Paris, 1930, pp.339-40) also made this point.

670. W. Harrison Woodward (1897, p.42) wrote that Vittorino taught geometry in conjunction with drawing, mensuration and surveying. The inscription on Pisanello's medal links Vittorino's knowledge of mathematics, which he had studied under Biagio Pellicano da Parma, with his education in the humanities. M. Baxendall (Giotto and the Orators, London, 1971, pp.126-7) thinks that Alberti's De Pictura, because its reader understood neo-classical Latin, had some understanding of Euclid's Elements and drew or painted "at least potentially or notionally", was possibly directed towards Vittorino's school. If Vittorino's students understood Alberti's first chapter, they would have made sense of parts of De Re'.

671. Pietro del Tovaglia, Lodovico's agent in Florence, wrote of the choir of SS. Annunziata, "...messer batista dicie e chosi a sempre detto che sara piu bella chosa che vi sia, e che chostoro nollo intendeno perche e non sono usi a vedere simile chose, ma che quanto lo vedranno fatto che parra loro molto piu bello che la crocie." (Braghirolli, 1879, Doc.X, p.271, 27th April 1471.).

672. See above, Chapter IV, note 215.

673. Lodovico wrote to Luca, giving the impression perhaps of resigned concurrence with Alberti's ideas: "...circa il minuire quelli pillastri del portico etc., del che assai te commendiamo et poi chel pare cussi a lui, cussi pare anche ad nui." (Braghirolli, 1969, p.13; C. von Fabriczy, *Die Baugeschichte von S. Sebastiano in Mantua*, Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.XXVII, Berlin, 1904, pp.84-5). At any rate, Lodovico went along with a proposal on which he had not been consulted seriously, if at all.

674. See above, Chapter I, note 35.

675. Braghirolli, 1869, pp.14-15; G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, 1970 (1911), p.487; E. Johnson, S. Andrea in Mantua. The Building History, Penn. State Univ. Press, 1975, Doc.I, p.64.

676. "...Luca taglia pietra me mostra una lettera della S.V.

sopra el titulo 'ad turrim' etc. Hora me venne in mente de far questo che sara con queste lr. Iterum cogitabimus. Ceterum io intesi a questi di che la S. V. et questi vostri cittadini ragionavano de edificare qui a Sancto Andrea. Et che la intentione principale are per havere gram spatio dove molto popolo capesse a vedere el sangue de Christo. Vidi quel modello del Manetti. Piacquemi: ma non mi par apto a la intentione vostra. Pensai et congettai questo qual io vi mando. Questo sara piu capace, piu eterno, piu degno, piu lieto. Costera molto meno. Questa forma de tempio se nomina apud veteres 'etruscum sacrum'. Se'l ve piassera daro modo de rectarlo in proportionem." (From E. Johnson, ibid.).

677. For a discussion of Alberti's possible sources for the 'Etruscum Sacrum' in De Re', see, R. Krautheimer, "Alberti's Templum Etruscum", Munchen Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, Ser.3, XII, 1961, pp.65-72; also in Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, New York/London, 1969, pp.333-44.

678. E. Johnson (1970, p.26) notes that, but for Alberti's use of the word degno, commendation of his own design was in terms of commodity, firmness and delight. Since the word apto has been discussed above in connection with the remarks of Cardinal Roteno on the palace at Revere (Doc.223), it is perhaps appropriate to consider Alberti's use of the word in his letter to Lodovico. The

word seems to be used differently in the different contexts. Yet there will be a level of meaning common to both usages. In Document 223, there seems to be an implicit antithesis with the word superbo. It would probably be fair to say that superbo expresses what could be called an aesthetic quality, whilst apto identifies utilitarian merit. Alberti's architecture, in De Re', is functional. Firmness provides for the physical needs of buildings' occupants. The needs for which commodity provides are social -the mediating notion between man subject to the forces of nature and the self-sufficient intellectual life. Delight provides for spiritual and intellectual needs. As a building answers to these requirements, it is an adapting of forms to functions, and its merit is utilitarian, rather than aesthetic in the narrow sense of the word.

679. For example, Alberti had Gianozzo say, in Book II of Della Famiglia (Opere Volgari, Vol.I, 1960, p.252), "Ma la virtù non si conosce se non quando sia per opera manifestata."
680. E. Johnson, 1970, p.42. See also, E. Johnson, 1975, p.11; Braghirolli, 1869, Doc.VII.
681. C. Brown (1972, p.155) writes that the letter of 12th September 1475, "...provides ... support for the claim that Lodovico was an amateur architect or perhaps more accurately, that he took a keen interest in the diverse aspects of the discipline." The first part of the statement

finds confirmation here. See also, the letter of Lodovico to Luca from Saviola, of 15th September 1475 (ibid.): "Non vogliamo gia pero tu stimi che questo scrivere nostro sia perche 'l discipulo voglia dare lege al magistro, ma solamente per dirli el parere suo."

682. C. Cottafavi, "Ricerche e documenti sulla costruzione del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova dal Secolo XIII al secolo XIX", Atti e Memorie della Reale Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, N.S., Vol.XXV, Pt.3, 1939, "La Loggia del Castello di Mantova", pp.197-202.
683. See, for example, his letter of 20th October 1451, to Gisulfo de Gisulfis (Doc.104), or his letter of 8th August 1465, to Giovanni da Padova (Mazzoldi, 1961, p.32).
684. See above, note 681.
685. U. Rossi, "Cristoforo Geremia", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, Roma, 1888, pp.404-41.
686. Cottafavi, op.cit., p.201.
687. Lodovico's brother, Alessandro, visited the Badia of Fiesole in 1461. See, A. Portioli, I Gonzaga ai Bagni di Petriolo di Siena nel 1460 e 1461, Mantova, 1876, p.27ff.
688. Works of military engineering were perhaps properly and

practically the business of the prince. Filarete's otherwise inexpert patron, Francesco Sforza, yet involved himself in the detailed designing of the tower (Filarete/Spencer, f.99v.). The Signoria of Florence sought Francesco's opinion of the design for the castle at Pisa. Antonio Manetti was sent to Milan with it. On 13th March 1460, Francesco wrote a covering letter with a design and suggestions to the Signoria. He deprecated his own advice, explaining that it was necessary to see the site and proclaiming that he was not pratico (Gaye, Carteggio Inedito..., Vol.I, Doc.LXXVIII, pp.194-5). The Signoria seem to have complimented Francesco on his knowledge of military engineering. Modestly, Francesco denied the compliment. C. Ricci (Il Tempio Malatestiano, Milano/Roma, 1925, p.139ff.) emphasized Sigismondo Malatesta's practical involvement with works of military architecture.

Chapter VIII.

689. See above, Chapter II, note 74.

690. C. Tanturli ("Per l'interpretazione storica della 'Vita del Brunelleschi'", Paragone, 301, 1975, pp.5-25) suggests that the Vita was partly a polemic against Alberti, who was seen as a purveyor of precepts, and therefore as an authoritarian figure. In the light of a dispute between the theory of Alberti and the practice of Brunelleschi, the antiquarianism of the choir of SS. Annunziata could arouse the ire of one of the factions in the polemic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The volumes, Mantova, La Storia, Le Lettere, Le Arti, provide the most extensive sources of bibliographical information. Here, reference is made to works indicated in the thesis.

Archival Sources.

Archivio di Stato di Mantova.

Archivio di Stato di Firenze.

Primary Published Sources.

L.B. Alberti, Opere Volgari, a cura di A. Bonucci, Vol.I, Firenze, 1844, containing the "Biography", pp.88-109.

L.B. Alberti, Leonis Baptistae Alberti - Opera Inedita et Pauca Separatim Impressa, a cura di G. Mancini, Firenze, 1890.

L.B. Alberti, Della Famiglia, in Opere Volgari, a cura di C. Grayson, Vol.I, Bari, 1960, pp.3-341.

L.B. Alberti, Ten Books on Architecture, Trans. J. Leoni, Ed. J. Rykwert, London, 1965 (Reprint of 1755 Edition).

L.B. Alberti, L'Architettura, a cura di R. Bonelli & P. Portoghesi (Testo e Trad. G. Orlandi, Introd. e note, P. Portoghesi),

Milano, 1966.

L.B. Alberti, Ludi Rerum Mathematicarum, in Opere Volgari, a cura di C. Grayson, Vol.III, Bari, 1973, pp.134-73.

Thomas Aquinas, De Principiis Naturae, Introd., J. Fauson, Fribourg, 1950.

Thomas Aquinas, Selected Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, Trans. R. Goodwin, Ohio, 1965.

L. Ariosto, Orlando Furioso, Canto XLII, 73-77.

Aristotle, Metaphysics, The Works of Aristotle, Vol.VIII, Ed. J. Smith & W. Ross, Oxford, 1908.

Aristotle, Aristotle's Physics, Trans. R. Hope, Nebraska Univ. Press, 1961.

G.P. Arrivabene, Gonzagidos, in Vitae Summorum Dignitate et Eruditione Virorum ex rarissimis monumentis literato orbi restituae, Ed. J. Meuschen, Vol.III, Coburgi, MDCCXXVIII, pp.1-75.

Alberto Avogadro, De Religione et Magnificentia Illustris Cosmi Medices Florentini, in Deliciae Eruditorum seu veterum anekdoton opusculorum collectanae, Vol.XII, Florentinae, MDCCXLII.

F. Biondo (da Forlì), Roma Ristaurata et Italia Illustrata di

Biondo da Forlì. Tradotte in buona lingua volgare per Luciano Fauno, Venezia, 1542.

Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite de'uomini illustri del secolo XV, a cura di P. d'Ancona & E. Aeschlimann, Milano, 1951.

Bullarium Franciscum ... ad tres ordines S.P.N. Francisci spectantia, N.S., Vol.I, Quaracchi, 1929.

Filarete (Antonio Averlino), Filarete's Treatise on Architecture, Facsimile, and Trans. J. Spencer, Yale, 1965.

Filarete (Antonio Averlino), Trattato di Architettura, a cura di R. Bonelli & P. Portoghesi (Testo, A. Finoli & L. Grassi, Introd. e Note, L. Grassi), Milano, 1972.

F. di Giorgio, Trattati di architettura, ingegneria e arte militare, a cura di C. Maltese, Transcr. L. Maltese Degrassi, Milano, 1967.

A. Manetti, The Life of Brunelleschi by Antonio di Tuccio Manetti, Trans. C. Enggass, Introd. etc. H. Saalman, Penn. State Univ. Press, 1970.

Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini), Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae temporibus suis contingerunt, a J. Gobellino ... compositi..., Romae, 1584.

Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini), The Commentaries of Pius II, Trans. F. Gragg, Ed. L. Gabel, Smith College Studies in History, Northampton, Mass., Vol.XXV, nos.1-4, Oct. 1939 - July 1940.

Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi), Historia Inclytae Urbis Mantuae et Serenissimi Familiae Gonzagae, Vienna, 1685.

Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi), Historiam Urbis Mantuae Gonziacaeque Familiae, in Thesaurus Antiquitatum et Historiarum Italiae, Transpadanae et Alpibus Vicinae, a cura di J. Graevius, Vol.IV, Pt.II, Lugduni, 1722.

Platina (Bartolomeo Sacchi), Vita di Vittorino da Feltre, a cura di G. Biasuz, Padova, 1948.

Filippo Redditi, Exhortatio ad Petrum Medicem in magnanimi sui parentis imitationem, in Deliciae Eruditorum seu veterum anekdoton opusculorum collectanae, Vol.XII, Florentinae, MDCCXLII.

A. Schivenoglia, Cronaca di Mantova di Andrea Schivenoglia dal M.CCCC.XLV al M.CCCC.LXXXIV, Transcr. C. d'Arco, in Raccolta di Cronisti e Documenti Storici Lombardi Inediti, Vol.II, Ed. G. Muller, Milano, 1875.

G. Vasari, Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari, con nuove annotazioni e commenti di Gaetano Milanesi, Firenze, 1973 (Reprint of 1906 Edition).

Vitruvius, The Ten Books on Architecture, Trans. M. Hicky Morgan, New York, 1960.

Secondary Published Sources.

J. Ackerman, "Sources of the Renaissance Villa", Studies in Western Art, Vol.II, Princeton, 1963, pp.6-18.

M. dall'Acqua, "Storia di un progetto albertiano non realizzato: La ricostruzione della Rotonda di San Lorenzo in Mantova", in Il Sant' Andrea di Mantova e Leon Battista Alberti, Atti, Mantova, 25-26 Aprile, 1972, Mantova, 1974, pp.229-36.

F. Amadei, Cronaca Universale della Città di Mantova, a cura di G. Amadei, E. Marani, G. Pratico, Mantova, 1954-57 (Vol.II, 1954).

Amministrazione del Duomo di Milano, Annali della fabbrica del Duomo di Milano dall'origine fino al presente..., a cura della sua amministrazione, Milano, 1877-85 (Vol.II, 1880).

Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Archivio Mediceo Avanti il Principato, Vol.I, Roma, 1951.

C. d'Arco, Delle Arti e degli Artefici di Mantova, Mantova, 1857.

C. d'Arco, Studi Intorno al Municipio di Mantova, Mantova, 1871-74.

E. Arslan, Venezia Gotica, Venezia, 1972.

G. Paccini, Le Ville Medicee di Caffaggiolo e di Trebbio in Mugello, Firenze, 1892.

H. Baron, "Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought", Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies, Vol.XIII, Jan. 1938, no.1, pp.1-37.

C. Bassani, A. Galdi, A. Poltronieri, "Analisi per il restauro del tempio di San Sebastiano in Mantova", in Il Sant' Andrea di Mantova e Leon Battista Alberti, Atti, Mantova, 25-26 Aprile, 1972, Mantova, 1974, pp.243-63.

C. Battaglia, La Rotonda di San Lorenzo in Mantova, Mantova, 1955.

E. Battisti, "Il Mantegna e la Letteratura Classica", Atti del VI Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento. Arte, Pensiero e Cultura a Mantova nel Primo Rinascimento in Rapporto con la Toscana e con il Veneto, Firenze-Venezia-Mantova, 27 Sett. - 1 Ott. 1961, Firenze, 1965, pp.23-56.

M. Baxendall, Giotto and the Orators, London, 1971.

M. Baxendall, Review of Pisanello by G. Paccagnini, Art Bulletin, Vol.57, 1975, pp.130-31.

R. Bellodi, "La Casa di Giovanni Boniforte a Mantova", Arte

Italiana Decorativa ed Industriale, Vol.4, 1904.

L. Beltrami, "L'Annullamento del contratto di matrimonio fra Galeazzo Maria Sforza e Dorotea Gonzaga (1463)", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno 16, Fasc.I, 1889, pp.126-132.

L. Beltrami, Soncino e Torre Pallavicina, Milano, 1898.

L. Beltrami, Vita di Aristotele da Bologna, Milano, 1912.

L. Beltrami, Luca Beltrami e il Duomo di Milano, Ed. A. Cassi Ramelli, Milano, 1964 (Beltrami's publications regarding the Duomo, 1881-1914).

B. Berenson, The Italian Painters of the Renaissance, Phaidon, 1959.

C. Berselli, "La Pianta di Mantova di Gabriele Bertazzolo", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno II, Quad 10, 1967, pp.278-97.

A. Bertolotti, Artisti bolognesi, ferraresi ed alcuni altri, Bologna, 1862.

A. Bertolotti, "Architetti, Ingegneri e Matematici in relazione coi Gonzaga, signori di Mantova nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII", Giornale Ligustico, Genova, 1889.

A. Bertolotti, Figuli, Fonditori e Scultori in relazione con

la Corte di Mantova nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII, Milano, 1890.

A. Bertolotti, I Comuni e le parrocchie della provincia mantovana, Mantova, 1893.

S. Bettinelli, Delle Lettere e delle Arti Mantovane, Mantova, 1774.

G. Biscaro, "Documenti milanesi inediti su Francesco Filelfo," Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XL, Fasc.XXXVIII, Milano, 1913.

E. Boriani, Castelli e Torre dei Gonzaga nel Territorio Mantovano, Brescia, 1969.

W. Braghirolli, "Leon Battista Alberti a Mantova. Documenti e Notizie Inedite", Archivio Storico Italiano, Ser.II, Vol.IX, Pt.1, 1869, pp.3-31.

W. Braghirolli, "Donatello a Mantova: con documenti inediti", Giornale di Erudizione Artistica, Vol.II, 1873, pp.4-10.

W. Braghirolli, "Notizie e documenti inediti intorno a Pietro Vannucci detto il Perugino", Giornale di Erudizione Artistica, Vol.IV, 1875, pp.73-76.

W. Braghirolli, "Luca Fancelli, scultore, architetto e idraulico del secolo XV", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Vol.III, Fasc.IV, 1876, pp.610-38.

W. Braghirolli, Lettere Inediti di Artisti del sec. XV cavate dall'Archivio Gonzaga, Mantova, 1878.

W. Braghirolli, "Die Baugeschichte der Tribuna der Santissima Annunziata in Florenz", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.II, Berlin/Stuttgart, 1879, pp.259-79.

W. Braghirolli, "Virgilio e i Gonzaga", Album Virgiliana, 1883, pp.175-83.

B. Bresciani, Castelli Veronesi, Verona, 1962.

Brizeghel, Un collezione di luoghi notevoli della provincia di Mantova, Venezia, c.1853.

A. Brown, "The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de' Medici 'Pater Patriae'", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.24, 1961, pp.186-221.

C. Brown, "Luca Fancelli in Mantua -a checklist of his 185 letters to the Gonzaga with an appendix on the dating of letters regarding Luca Fancelli and Giovanni Bellini", Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Instituts in Florenz, Band XVI, Heft 2, 1972, pp.153-66.

C. Brown, "New Documents for Andrea Mantegna's 'Camera degli Sposi'", Burlington Magazine, Vol.CXIV, 1972, pp.861-63.

H. Burns, "Quattrocento Architecture and the Antique: Some Problems", in Classical Influences on European Culture, A.D. 550-1500, Ed. R. Bolgar, Cambridge, 1971, pp.269-87.

J. Caldwell, "Mantegna's St Sebastiano, 'Stabilitas' in a pagan world", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.36, 1973, pp.373-77.

C. Calzecchi Onesti, Il Castello Visconteo di Pavia, Roma, 1934.

R. Campagnari, "La Ghirardina di Motteggiana", in Palazzi e Ville del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, pp.7-14.

G. Campori, "Una Visita del Marchese di Mantova al Duca Borso in Sassuolo", Atti e Memorie delle R.R. Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Province dell'Emilia, N.S., Vol.VI, Pt.I, 1881, pp.119-25.

G. Campori, Gli Architetti e gli Ingegneri Civili e Militari degli Estensi, Modena, 1882.

G. Carocci, La Villa Medicea di Careggi, Firenze, 1888.

P. Carpeggiani, "Decadenza delle Ville Gonzaghesche", L'Arte, n.6, 1969, pp.119-39.

P. Carpeggiani, "Luca Fancelli, architetto civile nel contado

gonzaghesco", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971, pp.37-44.

P. Carpeggiani, "Congruenze e Parallelismi nell'Architettura Lombarda della seconda meta del '400: Il Filarete e Luca Fancelli", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 38-9, 1973, pp.53-69. "Il Filarete".

P. Carpeggiani, Il Palazzo Gonzaghesco di Revere, Mantova, 1974.

E. Casalini, Il Chiostro Grande della SS. Annunziata di Firenze, Firenze, 1967.

A. Cassi Ramelli, "Scacchieri Fortificati Italiani", Castellum, Roma, Castel S. Angelo, 3, 1966, pp.18-24.

D. Chambers, Patrons and Artists in the Italian Renaissance, London, 1970.

D. Chambers, "Sant' Andrea at Mantua and Gonzaga Patronage 1460-1472", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.40, 1977, pp.99-127.

L. Cittadella, Documenti ed Illustrazioni risguardanti la Storia Artistica Ferrarese, Ferrara, 1868.

C. Clough, "Federigo da Montefeltro's Patronage of the Arts, 1468-82", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol. 36, 1973, pp.129-44.

G. Coniglio, Mantova, La Storia, Vol.I (with preface by L. Bulferetti), Mantova, 1958.

Corpus Nummorum Italicorum, Vol.IV, Lombardia (Zecche Minori), Bologna, 1970.

C. Cottafavi, Enciclopedia Italiana dell'Istituto Treccani, Vol.XIV, 1932-40, pp.783-84, "Fancelli".

C. Cottafavi, "Ricerche e Documenti sulle costruzioni del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova dal secolo XIII al secolo XIX", Atti e Memorie della R. Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, N.S., Vol.XXV, 1939, pp.171-229.

C. Cottafavi, "La Nova Domus", Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, Vol.XXXIV, 1963, pp.8-18.

S. Davari, "I Palazzi del Antico Comune di Mantova e gli Incendi da Essi Subiti", Atti della R. Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova, 1888, pp.37-55 (Also Extract).

S. Davari, "Il Matrimonio di Dorotea Gonzaga con Galeazzo Maria Sforza", Giornale Ligustico di Archeologia, Storia e Letteratura, Anno 16, 1889, pp.367-90 & pp.401-13.

S. Davari, "I Palazzi dei Gonzaga in Marmiolo", Gazetta di Mantova, n.254, 14/5 Sett. 1890.

S. Davari, "Ancora della chiesa di S. Sebastiano di Mantova e di Luca Fancelli", Rassegna d'Arte, n.6, 1901, pp.93-95.

S. Davari, Notizie storiche topografiche della città di Mantova nei secoli XIII, XIV, e XV, Mantova, 1903.

E. Driscoll, "Alfonso of Aragon as a patron of art. Some reflections on the decoration and design of the Triumphal Arch of the Castel Nuovo in Naples", Essays in honor of Karl Lehmann, Ed.

L. Freeman Sandler, Marsyas Supplement, New York, 1964, pp.87-96.

I. Donesmondi, Dell'Istoria Ecclesiastica di Mantova, Vol.I, Mantova, 1612-16.

M. Equicola, Dell'Istoria di Mantova, Ed. F. Osanna, Mantova, 1610.

C. Eubel, Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi, Vol.II, Regensburg, 1914.

Exhibition Catalogue, Mostra Storica Nazionale della Miniatura, Palazzo di Venezia, Roma, Firenze, 1954.

C. von Fabriczy, Filippo Brunelleschi, sein Leben und seine Werke, Stuttgart, 1892.

C. von Fabriczy, "Giuliano da Maiano", Jahrbuch der Koniglich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, Vol.24, Berlin, 1903, pp.137-76.

C. von Fabriczy, "Die Baugeschichte von San Sebastiano in Mantua", Repertorium fur Kunstwissenschaft, Vol.XXIV, Berlin/Stuttgart, 1904, pp.84-85.

C. von Fabriczy, "Michelozzo di Bartolomeo", Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, Vol.25, 1904, pp.34-110.

E. Faccioli, Mantova, Le Lettere, Vols. I & II (with preface by L. Caretti), Mantova, 1959 & 1962.

E. Faccioli, "Il Palazzo Ducale di Revere e un episodio del 'Orlando Furioso'", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno I, n.1, 1966, pp.7-12.

V. Fasolo, "L'Architettura di Mantegna", Atti del VI Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento. Arte, Pensiero e Cultura a Mantova in Rapporto con la Toscana e con il Veneto, Firenze-Venezia-Mantova, 27 Sett. - 1 Ott. 1961, Firenze, 1965, pp.219-32.

V. Fasolo, "L'Ispirazione Romana negli Sfondi Architettonici del Mantegna", Palladio, N.S., Anno XIII, 1963, pp.79-84.

W. Ferguson, "Interpretation of the Renaissance", Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XII, no.4, 1951, pp.483-95.

W. Ferguson, "Towards the Modern State", in The Renaissance. Six Essays, New York, 1962, pp.1-27.

G. Fiocco, Mantegna, French Edition, Trans. J. Chuzeville, Milano, 1937.

G. Fiocco, "Andrea Mantegna e il Brunelleschi", Atti del 1° Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura, Firenze, 1938, pp.179-83.

H. Folnesics, "Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Architektur und Plastik in Dalmatien", Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Institutes der K.K. Zentral-Kommission fur Denkmalpflege, Vol. VIII, Vienna, 1914, pp.27-196.

K. Forster, "Praxis stadischer Planung und Enneuerung in Mantua", Kunstchronik, 25 Jahre, Heft 10, Oct. 1972, pp.339-40 (summary of lecture).

M. Fossi Todorow, I Disegni del Pisanello e della sua Cerchia, Firenze, MCMLXVI.

P. Foster, "Per il disegno dell'ospedale di Milano", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 38-39, 1973, pp.1-22. "Il Filarete".

G. Franceschini, Figure del Rinascimento Urbinate, Urbino, 1959.

A. Frazer Jenkins, "Cosimo de' Medici's Patronage of Architecture and the Theory of Magnificence", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.33, 1970, pp.162-70.

E. Garin, L'Umanesimo Italiano, Bari, 1952.

E. Garin, La Cultura Filosofica del Rinascimento Italiano, Firenze, 1961.

G. Gaye, Carteggio Inedito d'Artisti dei secoli XIV, XV, XVI, Vol.I, 1326-1500, Firenze, 1839.

G. Gerola, "Vecchie insegne di casa Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.V, Anno XLV, Fasc.1, 1918, pp.97-110.

G. Gerola, "Un'Impresa ed un motto di casa Gonzaga", Rivista d'Arte, Anno XII, Ser.II, Anno II, 1930, pp.381-402.

N. Gianantoni, Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Roma, 1929.

S. Gionta, Fioretto delle Cronache di Mantova, Verona, 1576.

G. Giovannetti Mola, Il Marchese Marsilio Giovannetti di San Raffaele, stratega del secolo XVII nel Palazzo Ducale di Revere e nel Monferrato -La Storia del Palazzo Ducale di Revere, Ostiglia, 1958.

R. Goldthwaite, "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture", The American Historical Review, Vol.77, no.4, 1972, pp.977-1012.

R. Goldthwaite & W. Rearick, "Michelozzo and the Ospedale di San Paolo in Florence", Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches

Instituts in Florenz, Band XXI, Heft 3, 1977, pp.221-306.

V. Golzio & G. Zander, Storia di Roma, Vol.XXVIII, Bologna, 1968,
"L'Arte in Roma nel secolo XV", pp.297-300.

E. Gombrich, "The Early Medici as Patrons of Art", in Italian Renaissance Studies. A Tribute to the Late Cecilia M. Ady, Ed. E. Jacob, London, 1960, pp.279-311. Also in Norm and Form, London, 1966, pp.35-57.

E. Gombrich, "Alberto Avogadro's Description of the Badia of Fiesole and the Villa of Careggi", Italia Medioevale e Umanistica, n.5, 1962, pp.217-29.

L. Gori-Montanelli, Brunelleschi e Michelozzo, Firenze, 1957.

C. Grayson, "Alberti, Poliziano e Bernardo Bembo", Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, Il Poliziano e il suo tempo, Firenze, 23-26 Sett. 1954, pp.111-17.

C. Grayson, "The Humanism of Alberti", Italian Studies, Vol.XII, 1957, pp.37-56.

C. Grayson, An Autograph Letter from Leon Battista Alberti to Matteo de' Pasti, Nov. 18, 1454, New York, 1957.

C. Guasti, La Cupola di Santa Maria del Fiore, Firenze, 1857.

H. Hann & A. Renger-Putsch, Hohenstaufenburgen in Suditalien, Ingelheim-am-Rhein, 1961.

W. Harrison Woodward, Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators, Cambridge, 1897.

R. Hatfield, "Some Unknown Descriptions of the Medici Palace in 1459", Art Bulletin, Vol.52, 1970, pp.232-49.

D. Hay, "Italy and Barbarian Europe", in Italian Renaissance Studies. A Tribute to the late Cecilia M. Ady, Ed. E. Jacob, London, 1960, pp.48-68.

W-D. Heilmeyer, Korinthische Normelkapitelle, Heidelberg, 1970.

L. Heydenreich, "La Villa: Genesi e Sviluppi fino a Palladio", Palladio, Vol.XI, 1969, pp.11-22.

G. Hill, A Corpus of Italian Medals before Cellini, London, 1930.

C. Huelsen, Il Libro di Giuliano da Sangallo, Codice Vaticano Barberiniano Latino 4424, Leipzig, 1910.

I. Hyman, Fifteenth Century Florentine Studies: The Palazzo Medici and a Ledger for the Church of S. Lorenzo, Ph.D, 1968, New York University, University Microfilms.

I. Hyman, "Notes and Speculations on S. Lorenzo, Palazzo Medici

and an Urban Project by Brunelleschi", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.XXIV, no.2, 1975, pp.98-120.

G. Intra, "La Basilica di S. Sebastiano", Arte e Storia, Vol.II, 1883.

G. Intra, "Donatello e il Marchese Lodovico Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.II, Vol.III, 1886, pp.665-69.

G. Intra, "Il Castello di Goito", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Ser.II, Anno XV, 1888, pp.23-48.

K. Jaspers, Anselm and Nicholas of Cusa, Ed. H. Arendt, Trans. R. Manheim, Harvest Books, 1974.

E. Johnson, S. Andrea in Mantua, Ph.D., 1970, New York University, University Microfilms.

E. Johnson, S. Andrea in Mantua. The Building History, Penn. State Univ. Press, 1975.

H. Klotz, Die Fruhwerke Brunelleschis und die Mittelalterliche Tradition, Berlin, 1970.

F. Knapp, Andrea Mantegna, Stuttgart, 1910 (Klassiker der Kunst).

R. Krautheimer, "Alberti's Templum Etruscum", in Studies in Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art, New York/London,

1969, pp.333-44 (From, Munchen Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst, Ser.3, Vol.XII, 1961, pp.65-72).

R. Krautheimer, Ghiberti, Princeton, 1972.

P. Kristeller, Mantegna, London, 1901.

R. Lamoureux, Alberti's Church of San Sebastiano in Mantua, Ph.D., 1975, New York University, University Microfilms.

S. Lang, "The Programme of SS. Annunziata in Florence", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.17, 1954, pp.288-300.

M. Lazzaroni & A. Munoz, Filarete, scultore e architetto del secolo XV, Roma, 1903.

P. Litta, Famiglie Celebri di Italia, Ser.Ia, Milano, 1841-43.

R. Longhi, Officina Ferrarese, Firenze, 1956.

A. Luzio, "I Corradi di Gonzaga di Mantova", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XL, Fasc.XXXVIII, Milano, 1913, pp.249-82.

A. Luzio, La Galleria dei Gonzaga venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-8, Milano, 1913.

A. Luzio, L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova. La Corrispondenza

Familiare, Amministrativa e Diplomatica dei Gonzaga, Vol.II,
Verona, 1922.

A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Platina e i Gonzaga", Giornale Storico
della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XIII, Torino, 1889, pp.430-40.

A. Luzio & R. Renier, "Il Filelfo e l'umanesimo alla corte dei
Gonzaga", Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, Vol.XVI,
1890, pp.118-217.

C. Mack, "The Rucellai Palace: some new proposals", Art Bulletin,
Vol.56, 1974, pp.517-29.

A. Magnaguti, Studi intorno alla zecca di Mantova, Milano, 1913.

T. Magnuson, "Studies in Roman Quattrocento Architecture",
Figura, no.7, Roma, 1968.

G. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, Roma, 1970 (Reprint
of 1911 Edition).

E. Marani & C. Perina, Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.II (with preface
by E. Arslan), Mantova, 1961.

E. Marani, "Gli Edifici Padronali della Campagna Mantovana",
in Palazzi e Ville del Contado di Mantova, a cura dell'Assoc-
iazione Industriale di Mantova, Firenze, 1966, pp.3-6.

A. Martindale & N. Garavaglia, The Complete Paintings of Mantegna, London, 1971.

V. Matteucci, Le Chiese Artistiche del Mantovano, Mantova, 1902.

L. Mazzoldi, Mantova, La Storia, Vol.II (with preface by M. Bendiscioli), Mantova, 1961.

E. Mendes Manuel & G. Dallai, "Nuove indagini sullo spedale degli Innocenti a Firenze", Commentari, Vol.XVII, 1966, pp.83-106.

P. Mezzanotte, "Il Duomo", in Storia di Milano, Vol.VI, Pt.VIII, Milano, 1955.

P-H. Michel, La Pensée de L.B. Alberti, Paris, 1930.

G. Milanesi, Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese, Vols.II & IV, Siena, 1854.

C. Mitchell, "Archaeology and Romance in Renaissance Italy", in Italian Renaissance Studies. A Tribute to the Late Cecilia M. Ady, Ed. E. Jacob, London, 1960, pp.455-83.

C. Mitchell, "Felice Feliciano Antiquarius", Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol.XLVII, pp.197-221.

V. Montanara, "Il Fancelliano Palazzo Ducale di Revere sta

Ritornando ai suoi Antichi Splendori", Gazetta di Mantova,
15 May 1970, p.6.

V. Montanara, "Storia e Leggende dei Castelli Mantovani -Revere",
Rivista Bimestrale della Camera di Commercio ... di Mantova,
n.34, 1971, pp.118-24.

S. von Moos, Die Kastelltyp-Variationen des Filarete, Zurich,
1971.

O. Morisani, Michelozzo Architetto, Torino, 1951.

F. Morandini, "Palazzo Pitti. La sua costruzione e i successivi
ingrandimenti", Commentari, Vol.XVI, 1965, pp.35-46.

C. Nigra, Torri, castelli e case forti del Piemonte dal 1000
al secolo XVI^o, Vol.I, "Il Novarese", Novara, 1937.

J. Onians, "Alberti and Filarete", Journal of the Warburg and
Courtauld Institutes, Vol.34, 1971, pp.96-114.

J. Onians, "Filarete and the 'Qualità': Architectural and
Social", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 38-9, 1973, pp.116-28, "Il
Filarete".

L. Ozzola, Il Museo Medievale di Mantova: Palazzo Ducale,
Mantova, n.d.

W. & E. Paatz, Die Kirche von Florenz, Vol.II, Darmstadt, 1955.

G. Paccagnini, Mantova, Le Arti, Vol.I (with preface by C. Gnudi), Mantova, 1960.

G. Paccagnini, "Il Mantegna e la Plastica dell'Italia Settentrionale", Bollettino d'Arte, Anno XLVI, Ser.IV, 1961, pp.65-100.

G. Paccagnini, "Il Ritrovamento del Pisanello nel Palazzo Ducale di Mantova", Bollettino d'Arte, Anno LII, Ser.V, 1967, pp.17-19.

G. Paccagnini, Il Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Torino, 1969.

G. Paccagnini, Pisanello e il ciclo cavalleresco di Mantova, Venezia, 1972.

G. Paccagnini, Pisanello alla corte dei Gonzaga, Mantova, Palazzo Ducale, a cura di G. Paccagnini con la collaborazione di M. Figlioli, Venezia, 1972 (Exhibition Catalogue).

G. Paccagnini, Pisanello, Trans. J. Carroll, Phaidon, 1973.

G. Pacchioni, "Belbello da Pavia e Gerolamo da Cremona -miniatori", L'Arte, Roma, 1915, Pt.I, pp.241-252, Pt.II, pp.343-372.

G. Pacchioni, "L'Opera di Luciano Laurana a Mantova", Bollettino d'Arte, N.S., Vol.III, 1923, pp.97-111.

G. & A. Pacchioni, Mantova, Bergamo, 1930.

G. Pacchioni, "La Camera Picta" di Andrea Mantegna nel Castello di Mantova, Milano, 1960.

M. Palvarini, La Casa di Giovan Boniforte da Concorezzo -una preziosa architettura del quattrocento mantovano, Mantova, 1964.

E. Panofsky, "Artist, Scientist, Genius", in The Renaissance: Six Essays, New York, 1962, pp.121-82.

A. Patricolo, Guida del Palazzo Ducale di Mantova, Mantova, 1908.

A. Patricolo, "La Chiesa di S. Francesco d'Assisi dei Minori Osservanti", Rassegna d'Arte, Anno XI, 1911, n.2, pp.33-6, n.3, pp.53-9.

C. Perogalli & G. Bascapé, Castelli della Pianura Lombarda, Milano, 1967.

C. Perogalli, "Borghi Fortificati tra le Province di Brescia e Mantova", Atti del XIV Congresso di Storia dell'Architettura, Brescia-Mantova-Cremona, 12-19 Sett. 1965, Roma, 1972, pp.83-93.

C. Perogalli & M. Sandri, Ville delle Province di Cremona e Mantova, Milano, 1973.

A. Pica, "Il Brunellesco e le origini del Rinascimento Lombardo",

Atti del 1^o Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura,
Firenze, 1938, pp.165-71.

A. Portioli, I Gonzaga ai Bagni di Petriolo di Siena nel 1460
e 1461, Mantova, 1876.

A. Possevino, Historia de Familia Gonzaga, Mantua, MDCXXVIII.

G. Pratico, "Lorenzo il Magnifico e i Gonzaga", Archivio Storico
Italiano, Anno CVII, 1949, pp.155-171.

L. Pratilli, "Felice Feliciano alla luce dei suoi codici", Atti
del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Anno 1939-40,
Vol.XCIX, Pt.II, pp.33-106 (Classe di Scienze, morali e letterari).

G. dal Prato, "Una Concezione di Luca Fancelli. Il Palazzo
Pastore di San Martino Gusnago", in Corti e Dimore del Contado
di Mantova, a cura dell'Associazione Industriale di Mantova,
Firenze, 1969, pp.3-11.

U. Procacci, "Cosimo de' Medici e la costruzione della Badia
Fiesolana", Commentari, Vol.19, 1968, pp.80-97.

L. Puppi, Il Trittico di Andrea Mantegna per la Basilica di San
Zeno Maggiore in Verona, Verona, 1972.

A. Quintavalle, Prospettiva e Ideologia, Alberti e la cultura
del secolo XV, Parma, 1967.

A. Ricci, Storia dell'Architettura in Italia dal secolo IV al XVII, Vol.II, Modena, 1858.

C. Ricci, Il Tempio Malatestiano, Milano/Roma, 1925.

E. Rocchi, Le Fonti Storiche dell'Architettura Militare, Roma, 1908.

F. Rodolico, Le Pietre delle Città d'Italia, Firenze, 1953.

F. Rodolico, "Ricerca ed acquisto di 'pietre antiche' alla corte dei Gonzaga", Archivio Storico Italiano, Anno CXIV, 1956, pp.749-53.

A. Romanini, "Un nuovo complesso di tavolette da soffitto quattrocentesche", Arte Lombarda, Anno IV, 1959, pp.58-66.

A. Romanini, L'Architettura Gotica in Lombardia, Milano, 1964.

H. Rose, A Handbook of Greek Mythology, London, 1956.

P. Rose, "Humanist Culture and Renaissance Mathematics: The Italian Libraries of the Quattrocento", Studies in the Renaissance, Vol.XX, New York, 1973, pp.46-105.

P. Roselli, Core e Cupola della SS. Annunziata a Firenze, Pisa, 1971.

J. Ross & M. M^CLauglin (Editors), The Portable Renaissance Reader, New York, 1967.

U. Rossi, "Cristoforo Geremia", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, Roma, 1888, pp.404-41.

U. Rossi, "Il Pisanello e i Gonzaga", Archivio Storico dell'Arte, Anno I, 1888, pp.453-56.

E. Ruhmer, Marco Zoppo, Vicenza, 1966.

H. Saalman, "Filippo Brunelleschi: Capital Studies", Art Bulletin, Vol.40, 1958, pp.113-37.

H. Saalman, "Early Renaissance Architectural Theory and Practice in Antonio Filarete's 'Trattato di Architettura'", Art Bulletin, Vol.41, 1959, pp.89-106.

H. Saalman, "Tommaso Spinelli, Michelozzo, Manetti and Rossellino", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.XXV, no.3, 1966, pp.151-64.

C. Saletti, "La fabbrica quattrocentesca dell'Ospedale di San Matteo in Pavia", Arte Lombarda, Anno V, 1960, pp.48-55.

M. Salmi, L'Architettura Romanica in Toscana, Milano, 1927.

M. Salmi, "Antonio Averlino detto il Filarete e l'architettura lombarda", Atti del 1° Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura, Firenze, 1938, pp.185-96.

M. Salmi, "La 'Domus Nova' dei Gonzaga", Atti del VI Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento. Arte, Pensiero e Cultura a Mantova nel Primo Rinascimento in Rapporto con la Toscana e con il Veneto, Firenze - Venezia-Mantova, 27 Sett. - 1 Ott. 1961, Firenze, 1965, pp.15-21.

M. Salmi, "Il Campanile della Cattedrale di Ferrara", Commentari, Vol.13, 1962, pp.79-87.

P. Sanpaolesi, "Il Palazzo Pitti e gli Architetti Fiorentini della Discendenza Brunelleschiana", Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf, Berlin, 1968, pp.124-35.

F. Saxl, "Jacopo Bellini and Mantegna as Antiquarians", in A Heritage of Images - A Selection of Lectures, Peregrine Books, Ed. H. Honor & J. Fleming, 1970.

A. Schiavi, Il restauro della chiesa di S. Sebastiano di Leon Battista Alberti in Mantova, Mantova, 1932.

C. Seymour, "Some Reflections on Filarete's Use of Antique Visual Sources", Arte Lombarda, Anno 18, 38-9, 1973, pp.36-47, "Il Filarete".

R. Signorini, "Lettura Storica degli Affreschi della 'Camera degli Sposi' di Andrea Mantegna", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, Vol.38, 1975, pp.105-35.

J. Sismondi, History of the Italian Republics, Bk.VII, London, 1832.

L. Sissa, "Notizie Storiche di Revere", in Brizeghel, Un Collezione di luoghi notevoli della provincia di Mantova, Venezia, c.1853.

J. Spencer, "Two New Documents on the Ospedale Maggiore, Milan -and on Filarete", Arte Lombarda, Anno XVI, 1971, pp.114-16.

K. Swoboda, "Palazzi Antichi e Medioevali", Bollettino del Centro di Studi per la Storia dell'Architettura, n.II, 1957, pp.3-32.

K. Swoboda, "The Problem of the Iconography of Late Antique and Early Medieval Palaces", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol.20, 1961, pp.78-89.

G. Tagliati, "Relazione tra la famiglia Romei e la corte estense nel secolo XV", in Il Rinascimento nelle Corti Padani, società e cultura, Bari, 1977, pp.61-76.

M. Tamassia, "Visioni di antichità nell'opera del Mantegna", Rendiconti, Atti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Vol.XXVIII, Fasc.III-IV, Anno 1955-56, Vaticano, 1957, pp.213-49.

C. Tanturli, "Per l'interpretazione storica della 'Vita del Brunelleschi'", Paragone, 301, 1975, pp.5-25.

F. Tarducci, "Gian Francesco Gonzaga, Signore di Mantova (1407-1420). Studi e Ricerche", Archivio Storico Lombardo, Anno XXIX, Milano, 1902, Fasc.XXXIV, pp.310-60, Fasc.XXXV, pp.33-89.

N. Tartaglia, Storia di Brescia, 1963, Pt.V, Chap.III.

W. Terni de Gregory, Pittura Artigiana del Rinascimento, Milano, 1958.

Thieme & Becker, Kunstler Lexikon.

I. Toesca, "Lancaster e Gonzaga: Il freggio della 'Sala del Pisanello' nel Palazzo Ducale di Mantova", Civiltà Mantovana, Anno VII, Quad.42, 1973, pp.361ff.

I. Toesca, "A Frieze by Pisanello", Burlington Magazine, Vol. CXVI, 1974, pp.210-14.

I. Toesca, "More about the Pisanello murals at Mantua", Burlington Magazine, Vol.CXVIII, 1976, pp.622-29.

P. Tonini, Il Santuario della Santissima Annunziata di Firenze, Firenze, 1876.

P. Torelli, L'Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova, Vol.I, Ostiglia, 1920.

A. Venturi, Storia dell'Arte Italiana, Vol.VII/3 (1914), Vol. VIII/1 (1923), Milano.

L. Vignetti, "'Concinnitas'; riflessioni sul significato di un termine albertiano", Studi e Documenti di Architettura, n.2, Firenze, 1973, pp.137-61.

L. Volta, Compendio Cronologico-critico della Storia di Mantova, Vol.II, Mantova, 1827.

L. Waddingus, Annales Minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco Institutorum, Vol.XII, Quaracchi, 1932.

J. Ward-Perkins, Roman Architecture, New York, 1977.

R. Weiss, The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, Oxford, 1969.

R. Wittkower, Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism, London, 1952.

A. Zanoli, "Sugli Affreschi del Pisanello nel Palazzo Ducale di Mantova", Paragone, 277, 1973, pp.23-44.